

[PRICE:—ONE SHILLING]

SPIRITUALISM UNMASKED

BEING A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE

REV. JOHN ALEX. DOWIE

AND

MR. THOMAS WALKER

(LECTURER FOR THE VICTORIAN ASSOCIATION OF SPIRITUALISTS)

WITH AN

INTRODUCTION BY MR. DOWIE

Melbourne:

GEORGE ROBERTSON, PUBLISHER;

AND AT

SYDNEY, ADELAIDE, AND BRISBANE.

1882.

SPIRITUALISM

UNMASKED :

BEING A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN

THE

REV. JOHN ALEX. DOWIE

AND

MR. THOMAS WALKER

(Lecturer for the Victorian Association of Spiritualists)

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY MR. DOWIE.

Melbourne :

GEORGE ROBERTSON, PUBLISHER,

AND AT

SYDNEY, ADELAIDE, AND BRISBANE.

MDCCCLXXXII.

INTRODUCTION.

It is necessary to inform the reader of these pages of some facts connected with the origin of the correspondence herein published; of the reasons which led the writer and his friends to place it before the public at this time, and in this manner; and of the serious dangers which threaten the world through the spiritualistic "pestilence that walketh in darkness," which is even already a "destruction that wasteth at noon-day."

After several letters had been received by me from the gentleman who appears in the following pages as Mr. A. D. S—, I at last consented to have a conversation with him on 3rd February, at his house, "on the subject of Spiritualism." In agreeing to do so, I was somewhat reluctant at first, principally because of the uncertainty of my stay in this city, and my conviction that, once entered upon here, the subject would lead me on into a prolonged controversy, as has proved to be the case. I do not regret the fact; but, for good reasons, I state these circumstances to show that, from the first, the Spiritualists of this city took the initiative, and cannot fairly complain that their challenge was taken up and dealt with in my own way.

It is of importance to note here the principal feature in my method of dealing with the subject. I can best explain that by quoting the following sentences from an unpublished letter of mine to Mr. A. D. S—, written on 30th January.

"Although I have given much attention to the subject of Spiritualism, it has largely been in one direction, and that the philosophy of it, as expressed in the writings of its principal exponents in England and the United States of America. With the phenomena I have comparatively little personal experience or concern; the question, as I view it, being not so much—Do spirits communicate with, or manifest themselves to, mortals now on earth?—for I see no reason whatever to deny or doubt that they can and do—but, Is the teaching, or whole *cultus*, so to speak, of Modern Spiritualism good or evil? Upon the decision of that question

in the affirmative or negative depends the whole issue as to the ORIGIN of spiritualistic manifestations and teachings, and whether they are to be held Divine or diabolical. I may say, at once, that my investigations and observations have led me to adopt, very firmly, the view that Spiritualism is DIABOLICAL in its origin, and is dangerous and hurtful in its effects upon the moral and spiritual nature of man. At the same time, as my conclusion has been reached without prejudice, and in a spirit of candour and desire for to know the truth, it is also held without bigotry or uncharitableness ; and I only state the position in which I stand, so that there may be no misunderstanding concerning it."

After a long conversation with Mr. A. D. S——, extending over five hours, that gentleman, who has been a "spiritualist" for fifteen years, informed me frankly that he was unaware of many of the indisputable facts which I produced to prove the diabolical nature of Spiritualism, as shown in the immoral and wicked teachings of its most prominent and accepted exponents. He subsequently visited me on several occasions, and seemed to me to be uneasy in mind, although still holding himself to be a Spiritualist. I found he was resting entirely on the phenomena which he had witnessed, the good origin of which he believed in ; but when I, without discussing or admitting the genuineness of all "the signs and lying wonders," pointed out that their reality was not incompatible with a diabolical origin, he was much confused, or, as Mr. Walker verbally described his mental condition, "he was very much disturbed." After one of these conversations, he seems to have met Mr. Walker, who is the publicly-acknowledged representative and lecturer of the Victorian Association of Spiritualists ; and the result of that meeting was the first letter in these pages, from which arose Mr. Walker's letter to me of the 6th February, and all that followed on either his part or mine.

The reader of these letters will perceive that, after Mr. Walker's letter of 20th February, there is an interval of about three weeks, during which I took no notice whatever of his extraordinary effusion, which I deemed utterly unworthy of serious reply, so far as he was personally concerned, since his letters had convinced me of his logical incompetence, and, I regret to say, his moral incompetence as a controversialist. I allowed the matter entirely to drop, and did not take any action whatever as to publishing, in any form, my views upon the subject, determining to wait until a favourable opportunity for delivering a series of lectures upon it should be given me by God, in His own good time.

But my silence was evidently misconstrued, by Mr. Walker and his friends, into an evidence of fear ; and so he rushed forth with his threatening letter of the 13th March, in which he stated his intention of publishing the correspondence as it stood, unless I at

once replied to his letter, which I found myself unable to describe as other than "a continent of infidel mud." This threat, of course, decided my course of action, and I at once informed him of my intention, "for the sake of others," of answering his letter, at the same time making certain fair stipulations as to the publication of the correspondence—the chief of which was my claim to read and approve the printers' proofs ere they went finally to press.

To that letter I received no answer; but I, nevertheless, proceeded with my reply at once, and sent it to him in a few days. Day after day passed, but there were no signs of the publication of the letters, which he had been so ready to threaten on the 13th March, when, as yet, I had not exercised my right of reply—a right which he was compelled to recognize was mine. Still there was silence—all the oracles were dumb; there was not a whisper heard, where just before there had been such a display of vain-glorious bluster. At last I determined to break the silence; and, after giving him nearly a clear day's notice of my intention, I called at his residence with my friend, Dr. Singleton. I asked when and how he intended to print the correspondence, and offered, on behalf of my friends, who desired its appearance, to bear one-half of the cost of printing it in a pamphlet form. To my surprise, he coolly informed me that he was in no hurry to print it now; and that he intended first to prepare "a reply" to my last letter, which he purposed including with the rest in a pamphlet, to be published just when it was convenient to him. I pointed out that mine was "the reply," and that anything he might now write would require "a reply" from me before publication, to which he might demand a right of further rejoinder, and so the correspondence might swell to an unreasonable bulk, too costly for publication. He was impervious to reason; was most offensive in manner and speech; repeatedly denounced me, with most excited gestures and stamping of feet, &c., calling me "a liar" and other names; and alleged that it was "cowardly" of me to wish the correspondence to close at this point.

I asked him wherein it was so, and he said because I had introduced totally new matter. Being pressed to specify, he pointed to the passage on page 37, referring to Voltaire, Paine, &c., which I at once showed him was only a reply to his assertions concerning these persons on pp. 17 and 19. Admitting that, he then alleged that my remarks at pp. 45–9, concerning Andrew Jackson Davis, were entirely new matter; but I pointed out that these were only proofs in support of my previous assertions concerning that writer, which he, at page 26, had asserted I had "acted dishonestly" in making, and which it was, therefore, imperatively necessary for me either to retract or to prove, and I had done the latter. But reason was utterly thrown away

upon him, and only served to inflame his passion and increase his abusiveness.

I, therefore, intimated the fixed intention of my friends to publish the correspondence as it stood, and offered to send the final proof-sheets for his inspection before they went to press, so that he might see that every word he had written and received was correctly printed.

He was kind enough to say that my offer was unnecessary, and that he could trust my honour; but he strongly protested against my friends' intention, and made dreadful threats of exposure, &c., amidst a storm of which the interview closed.

I have been thus particular over these apparently trivial facts, because of widespread misrepresentations of what occurred, which have reached me from many sources, and for some of which Mr. Walker is, I regret to say, directly responsible. All candid and honest readers must judge as to this matter, and I cannot but hope that all such will justify my action in publishing the correspondence as it stands at this date.

After Mr. Walker's letter of 13th March, I had no alternative but to do so at once, when he failed to fulfil his offensively-expressed threat; and, had I waited until he was ready to go to press, no one can safely say how long that would have been. I have done, with the entire approval of experienced and valued friends, what seemed right in my conscience, as in the sight of God my Saviour, to promote whose cause and kingdom I alone perform this duty, and with Him I can leave my justification against all slanders.

And now, I desire to add to these pages some considerations and facts as to the serious dangers which a spread of this "Spiritualistic Pestilence" inevitably involves, and as to the serious grounds which exist for supposing that such dangers are imminent, unless prompt measures be taken to "stamp it out," as a kind of moral and social small-pox which threatens the destruction of the bodies and souls of tens of thousands around us.

There is a most erroneous impression abroad, in the minds of many sincere Christians, that Spiritualism is not rapidly spreading, and many point to the recent census in proof of that view; but a closer acquaintance with facts would at once dispel that illusion.

There are probably tens of thousands of Infidels and Spiritualists in this country who allowed themselves, for various reasons, to appear under religious denominations with which they have no real connection whatever. There are also many persons, who openly profess Christianity, but who are secretly Spiritualists; and—I say it with care, and caution, and with deep regret—several of these traitors are to be found occupying Christian pulpits.

This is delicate, and even dangerous ground, I am aware; but I

know that to be true whereof I affirm, and it is laid upon my conscience to speak out the whole truth upon this matter, "impugn it whoso list." Theirs' be the blame with whom the shame lies. It is absolutely necessary to use great plainness of speech: for there are dangerous rocks ahead, and it is important that honest men should steer the ship, and not the blind tools of spiritual pirates.

In a singular manner, a few weeks ago, I discovered one of these ministerial traitors in one of the principal pulpits of this city. He was in the habit of meeting at *séances* with a certain circle in Melbourne; and he agreed, on one occasion, to allow "the spirits" who patronized that circle to inspire his sermons on a certain Sunday. He afterwards informed the circle that the experiment was a most perfect success; and he declared that he had seen the whole of what he had preached, written by "the spirits," whom he permitted to control him, in beautiful letters, in the open space before his eyes, whilst he was speaking! I happened to hear one of those sermons, and at once detected undoubtedly spiritualistic ideas, which led me to entertain strong suspicions, which were speedily changed into certainty.

A member of the "circle"—no other than the Mr. A. D. S—— of this correspondence—boasted to me one day that they had a popular minister amongst them, and stated the fact as to "the spirits" inspiring him to preach without previous trouble or study, they providing everything from the text to the end. I was offered his name in confidence, which I promptly declined to receive; but, I startled my informant, by at once naming the minister, whom I had previously suspected. Mr. A. D. S—— expressed the utmost surprise; asked me how I knew; said it was a secret known only to a few; that, if it were known, "it would ruin" the minister; and ended by begging me not to mention my discovery. I reserved my rights, and made no promise.

This is a significant fact. I do not think there are many such instances to be found among ministers here. I know absolutely of only another; but that there should be even one is a disgrace, and shows the reality of the danger. I record this case with much grief; but it is high time the false security of many should be dispelled, for the Enemy is in the very citadel of a slumbering Church.

I have not seen it to be my duty to do more than warn the minister in question, who still claims to be a Christian, whilst accepting the aid of spirits who deny Christ's divinity.

Deceit is the very atmosphere of Spiritualism, which has many gradations—as I have elsewhere shown—but ends at last in the awful doctrines and practices which my letters disclose. I never knew of a single Spiritualist of long standing who did not "fall away from the faith," if he was a Christian when he began: for the

"seducing spirits" are all agreed upon a denial of the divinity and atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amongst some of the recent impersonations by these "spirits of devils" are those of the late Rev. John Graham, of Sydney, and Dr. Adam Cairns, of this city, with both of whom I have had intercourse, when in the flesh, concerning Spiritualism; and the utterly ignorant nonsense which both these good and able men were represented as talking, was enough to convince any person of sense, that these were the utterances of "lying spirits," and not of those whom they personated. In both cases, the "lying spirit" denied Christ's divinity and atonement.

But I submit that the horrible sea of vice into which I have, in these letters, shown Spiritualism to be flowing, proves that the phenomena must be of diabolical origin.

There is nothing whatever in common between the angelic ministrations recorded in the Bible and the teachings and actions of "the spirits" who now curse this earth, and withstand all that is true and good; whilst they have everything in common with those demons against whom the Lord Jesus and His apostles fought.

Spiritualists themselves are, sometimes, driven to admit, and to find some way of accounting for, the indisputable abominations of Spiritualism; and, in attempting to perform their impossible task, they often expose themselves to well-merited contempt by their self-condemnatory admissions, and absurdly contradictory explanations. For instance, Dr. J. M. Peebles writes as follows:—
"Low, undeveloped spirits, from force of habit, &c., may enjoy the sight of lasciviousness, or for some scheming wicked purpose may psychologically lead mediums into debauchery and the unfruitful works of darkness. Low, selfish, disorderly spirits are at the bottom of the 'free lust movement,' known by the more attractive term, 'social freedom.'"

Again, the chief prophet of this dispensation of devils, Andrew Jackson Davis, in a recent book, entitled "*The Diakka and their Earthly Victims, being an Explanation of much that is false and repulsive in Spiritualism*," says—"A Diakka (the name of an order of spirits) is an unbalanced, not an evil person; he wanders in his own congenial forest, never resting, never satisfied with life; often amusing himself with jugglery and tricky witticisms; invariably victimizing others; secretly tormenting mediums, causing them to exaggerate in speech, and to falsify by acts; unlocking and unbolting the street doors of your bosom and memory; pointing your feet into wrong paths, and far more."

And can any reasonable being believe that the new gospel is of God, which has lying and vicious spirits for its evangelists? It is blasphemy of the vilest and most awful nature to impute such wickedness to God. But it is a blasphemy from which Spiritualists do not shrink.

It will be observed that A. J. Davis says the Diakka spirit is "NOT AN EVIL PERSON," though he is a spiritual vagabond who delights in inflicting pain, in teaching mediums to lie in word and deed, and in leading human beings into "wrong paths, and far more." It may, therefore, be reasonably asked—What is it, then, to be an "evil person," if such spirits as these are not, spirits which are leading men "into wrong paths," and "into debauchery and the unfruitful works of darkness?"

The spiritualistic answer to this question is given in these letters, and it is to that point I venture to direct the attention of every honest, truth-loving, and virtuous man and woman whom my words can reach, and, especially, the attention of every faithful friend and follower of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. That answer is in four words, and those are of their own choosing, "EVIL DOES NOT EXIST." I refer for proof to page 9, where these words are quoted, with many of a like nature, from the work of an authoritative exponent of Spiritualism, Dr. A. B. Child, of Boston, U.S.A. Hence, it is also an article of spiritualistic faith that "THERE ARE NO EVIL SPIRITS"—see page 47, where this doctrine is laid bare in their own words, as follows:—"Broadly and unreservedly I do declare that I know nothing of the existence of evil spirits anywhere in God's creation. ALL SPIRITS ARE GOOD, because immortal." Consequently, A. J. Davis, and J. M. Peebles, and all advanced Spiritualists, may very well say that those spiritual burglars and leaders in debauchery called the "Diakka" are *not* evil. They are their very good friends, who go about "unlocking and unbolting the street doors of the bosom and memory" of their deluded victims, stealing from them every virtue and truly good desire, and filling them with every vice, and lie, and evil passion. The proof of this is to be found, with considerable detail and illustration, in my letters of 13th February and 18th March, to which I refer the reader.

The bearing of these teachings upon the PHENOMENA of Spiritualism is, I again repeat, surely self-evident proof of the DIABOLICAL origin of these appearances and messages, so far as these are *genuine* and not the result of contemptible trickery upon the part of the mediums, or of the delusions, resulting from their own wickedness, to which both they and their victims are exposed without the intervention of evil spirits.

The exposures by Baldwin, Maskeleyne, Cook, and many others; the records of criminal courts in Europe and America; and facts regarding the knavery of certain mediums in Australia, which are within my own knowledge, are convincing proofs of the fact that portions of the phenomena are pitiful jugglery on the part of the mediums. An instance of that kind occurred in Sydney about two years ago, where a person named C—, who was the partner of a notorious medium there named R—, came

to me, and informed me of the details of a certain trick played by R——, with complete success, upon a number of literary, political, and scientific persons in that city. A public intimation by me that the facts were known, and might be used, caused the immediate departure of the medium, and the cessation of impudent nonsense and threats which came from the “spirits” attending that circle. At the same time C—— frankly informed me that he was still a Spiritualist, though he would no longer associate with professional mediums, whom he described in strong language; but he was beginning to question the good origin of certain phenomena, which he knew to be genuine beyond question. Only two days ago, I had a long conversation with a most intelligent gentleman, holding a good position in the Civil Service of this colony, who informed me that he was for several years a firm believer in Spiritualism as a divine revelation beneficial to man; but that he had for some time past become convinced of its diabolical and immoral character, whilst he was still firmly convinced of the reality of much of the phenomena, in the form of appearances, messages, and other “lying wonders,” such as “materialization of spirits,” all of which he believes to be the work of “seducing spirits.” I may add that this gentleman is not a Christian, nor is he an Infidel—he is a sincere, honest, and upright man, of large brain power and some literary fame, who is feeling his way back again into a life of faith, and is at present a close and careful student of the Bible, which he places far above all human productions. I may also add, “on account of whom it may concern,” that he has given me very much information concerning the practical working of Spiritualism in this city, and its effects upon its leaders and their followers, especially as regards its influence upon their moral conduct, all of which I have carefully noted, and will, after proper inquiry, use, should their future behaviour render it necessary. I have been much urged to make use, in this introduction, of certain other indisputable facts which have recently occurred in this city, proving the horrible consequences of Spiritualism; but I reserve them, and trust I may not require to employ such weapons against “the generation of vipers” who are now working such woe.

But here let me publicly ask a question, addressed also to “whom it may concern.” When is Mr. Walker prepared to discuss publicly with me—and it should be in an audience of *men* only—the proposal which I made in my first letter (*see* page 1), viz.—“Do the phenomena and teachings of ‘Modern Spiritualism’ warrant the conclusion that they will promote the intellectual, moral, social, and spiritual welfare of mankind?”

He declared verbally, on 1st April, in the presence of Dr. Singleton, and in a most tragic voice and manner, that he there and then “challenged” me to discuss “Spiritualism pure and

simple." I requested him to put it in writing, which he said he would, after we left, and forward it to me. More than a week has passed ; but it has not yet appeared. Account for it I cannot. It may be that "the spirits" keep the day on which he made it a kind of "All Fools' Day," and that some "Diakka" had control of him just at that moment—he claims to speak under inspiration, it must be remembered—and had, as A. J. Davis would say, been "amusing himself with jugglery and tricky witticisms," or "victimizing" him, or "secretly tormenting" him, or "causing him to exaggerate in speech," &c., &c. Who can tell? I gravely suspect it was a "Diakka," who had been "unlocking and unbolting the street doors of his bosom and memory" on that particular morning. I thought so at the time, and I think so now. Perhaps he will explain, though, that his proper guide and familiar spirit was most unfortunately absent in some distant part of "the Summerland," as Spiritualists call their heaven, on that one day. But then he must be a poor kind of protector, seeing he knew the previous day that I was coming. Perhaps, also, Mr. Walker and his friends did cry, as did some of old, "O Baal, hear us!" (1 Kings xviii. 26-27). Anyhow, as in their case, "There was no voice, nor any that answered." Ah, but who can tell whether he cried loud enough: for Mr. Walker has often declared, when lecturing, that "he is a spirit," of very high degree indeed, who controls and directs him. Ah, but, as Elijah said of Baal, that "spirit" was either "talking" (or "meditating" as the margin reads), or he was "pursuing" (perhaps there was a law case on amongst the demons, or a hunt after some other soul to destroy it), or he was "on a journey" (possibly to a gathering of lunatics in the moon, or elsewhere), or "peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked." Well, it is high time for him to rub his sleepy eyes: for I am greatly afraid the "Diakka" are spoiling his pupil.

But, meanwhile, some "spirit" must have seen the mess into which their *protégé* had fallen, and, for the present at all events, has managed to keep him quiet. Indeed, I hear, even whilst writing these pages, that some of "the spirits" have at certain *séances* in this city been saying very uncomplimentary things concerning him for venturing upon a correspondence with me; and, although he has been their faithful slave for years, scarcely daring to call his soul his own, permitting them to control him for many years and speak through him, just as a boy blows through a tin whistle, any tune they pleased; and, although he is even now "Lecturer" for the "Association" of their earthly victims—yet, I am credibly informed that many of "the spirits" mean to turn him adrift, if they can possibly manage it. This is apparently cruel. But what else could be expected, if it takes place. These "spirits" are wise in their own way. But they

will find new tools, they will make new fools—some are eager, already, for his place—and they will again abandon them to their fate when trouble comes.

That is the well-ascertained method of the Devil, and all his “seducing spirits” in every age, from the time of Cain, “who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother” (1 John iii. 12), to the days of Judas Iscariot, “when Satan entered into” him (Luke xxii. 3) and made him a thief, a liar, a money-worshipper, and a murderer—both of whom the demons abandoned to shame, infamy, self-condemnation, and despair. Since their days, until the present, many have followed in their footsteps, and in other paths, giving heed to evil spirits:—“These speak evil of things which they know not; but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gain-saying of Core” (Jude 11-12).

And this awful and truthful description of “these filthy dreamers,” who “defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities” (Jude 8) brings me to a brief consideration, intended especially for Christians, of the teachings of the Holy Scriptures upon this subject of Spiritualism.

It is of especial consequence that we consider the teachings of the Spirit of God, in the “more sure word of prophecy; whereunto *we* do well that *we* take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in our hearts” (2 Peter i. 19). I will, for the present, examine principally the New Testament prophecy bearing upon this subject.

Let me observe (1) that the Lord Jesus has foretold, and prepared His followers for, this conflict with the Powers of Hell and Darkness.

His own entrance upon His earthly ministry began with that conflict, and although we have not any record of the details of that great struggle for the empire of the human race, yet we have the closing scenes, in which we see that by His use of “the sword of the Spirit”—“IT IS WRITTEN”—He gives the Great Tempter himself, after a forty days’ battle, the final blows which put him to flight (Matthew iv. 1-11). His whole course of ministry is beautifully summed up by Peter (Acts x. 38):—“God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, AND HEALING ALL THAT WERE OPPRESSED OF THE DEVIL: for God was with Him.” He traced physical, as well as spiritual, diseases to this cause; and, when healing a woman who could “in nowise lift up herself,” and was “bowed together,” He recognized in her “A SPIRIT OF INFIRMITY;” and when blamed for casting out this devil on the Sabbath day, He justified Himself by saying, “Ought not this

woman, WHOM SATAN HATH BOUND, LO! THESE EIGHTEEN YEARS, be loosed from her infirmity on the Sabbath day" (Luke xiii. 10-17). He constantly "cast out devils," and He was accompanied in His journeyings throughout Palestine (see Luke viii. 1-3) by "the Twelve, and certain women which had been HEALED OF EVIL SPIRITS and infirmities: Mary that was called Magdalene, FROM WHOM SEVEN DEVILS HAD GONE OUT, and Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others who ministered unto Him of their substance." It is also recorded that "He called the Twelve together, and GAVE THEM POWER OVER ALL DEVILS (Luke ix. 1); that "the Seventy returned with joy, saying, Lord, even THE DEVILS ARE SUBJECT UNTO US IN THY NAME," that He said, "I give unto you POWER TO TREAD ON SERPENTS AND SCORPIONS (symbolical words for devils), and OVER ALL THE POWER OF THE ENEMY" (Luke x. 17-22); that His last earthly conflict, like His first, was with the Devil, when, just before His crucifixion and death He said, "THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD cometh, and hath nothing in Me" (John xiv. 30); and the Apostle John, long after, sums up the whole object of Christ's manifestation to be "that He might DESTROY THE WORKS OF THE DEVIL" (1 John iii. 8): thus showing Him to be the fulfiller of all Old Testament prophecies, the first of which was given when God said to that old serpent, the Devil, in Paradise, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed (between *devils* and *sons of God*); it SHALL BRUISE THY HEAD, and thou shalt bruise His heel." Now, this work has been begun by Christ; is going on by His Spirit; and will be finished when, in due time, "He hath put all things under His feet." So that the Church of Christ may assuredly rest upon the prophecy of God's word:—"And the God of peace SHALL BRUISE SATAN under your feet shortly" (Romans xvi. 20).

I observe (2) that Christ gave "power over all devils" to His people by the gift of the Holy Spirit; that this power was exercised throughout the Apostolic age; and that the conflict with the spirits of hell and darkness was set forth as the Great Warfare of the Church of Christ.

The promise of Christ was that they were to "receive power when the Holy Ghost is come upon you" (Acts i. 8); and this "power," which came at Pentecost, remains now, according to the promise of our Lord, who said, "He shall be with you for ever" (John xiv. 16). The manifestations of this power were shown in the *gifts of convincing speech* conferred upon believers (Acts ii.), which resulted in the immediate conversion of three thousand souls (verse 41). In *gifts of healing* added thereto, one remarkable case, that of the man lame from birth who sat at the "Beautiful" gate of the Temple, resulting in the

immediate conversion of five thousand men (Acts iv. 4). In *gifts of prevailing prayer* (Acts iv. 24-31)—for “when they had prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered, and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness.” In *GIFTS OF DISCERNING EVIL SPIRITS*, as in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira, when Peter said, “Ananias, WHY HATH SATAN FILLED THY HEART to lie to the Holy Ghost” (Acts v. 3). And lastly, IN *GIFTS OF POWER TO CAST OUT AND TO CONTROL DEVILS*, as when Peter healed “everyone who was VEXED WITH UNCLEAN SPIRITS” (Acts v. 16); or as when, through the preaching of Philip, in the city of Samaria, many were cast out, “for from MANY of those which had UNCLEAN SPIRITS, THEY CAME OUT, crying with a loud voice” (Acts viii. 4-8); or as when Paul conquered that “CHILD OF THE DEVIL,” Elymas, the sorcerer, at Cyprus, who was struck with blindness, and silenced (Acts xiii. 6-12); or as when, at Philippi, the same Apostle, being “sore troubled” with “A SPIRIT OF DIVINATION” which possessed a certain maid there, “turned and SAID TO THE SPIRIT, I charge thee in the name of Jesus Christ to COME OUT OF HER, and it CAME OUT THAT VERY HOUR” (Acts xvi. 16-18); or as at Ephesus, where “THE EVIL SPIRITS WENT OUT” (Acts xix. 12), at which place, also, when “certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, we adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth,” the “spirits” would not own these hypocrites, and so one “EVIL SPIRIT answered, and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye? And the man in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house, naked and wounded” (Acts xix. 15-16). A warning to all sham Christians!

And these illustrations of the fact that this “power over all devils” was directly exercised throughout the Apostolic age by believers in the Lord Jesus, “in the power of the Spirit,” are also supported by the inspired exhortations to its continued exercise, and by reminders that it is with these “devils” that the Christian’s warfare lies—in every condition, and in every age.

Paul warns the Church at Corinth against those who would “corrupt their minds from the simplicity and purity that is toward Christ,” and who act as “THE SERPENT” who beguiled Eve in his craftiness” (2 Corinthians xi. 3). And, in the same chapter (verses 13-15), he declares that “such men are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ.” This transformation, he says, is a proof of their being under diabolical control, for he argues that they are the “MINISTERS” OF SATAN, who “himself is transformed into an angel of light.” This warning is similar to that of our Lord (Matthew xxiv. 24), where He says, “For there shall arise false

Christs and false prophets, and *shall show great signs and wonders*, insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." And, in addition to these Satan-inspired deceivers, Paul reminds the Corinthian Christians that they must not look upon *idols* as if they represented nothing, but that the idolaters around them were really "SACRIFICING TO DEVILS," were holding "FELLOWSHIP WITH DEVILS," and were drinking, in their heathen feasts, "THE CUP OF DEVILS," and sitting at "THE TABLE OF DEVILS" (1 Corinthians x. 19-22).

Here let me, in passing, note that it is within my own knowledge that the principle of diabolical communion and sacrifice is at the present moment fully established amongst Modern Spiritualists, at what are known as "materialization *séances*" in this city, and elsewhere, to which silly men and women bring bouquets of flowers, and other things of more importance, for "the spirits of devils" with whom they meet. On another occasion, I shall have more to say on that subject. But I continue.

Paul warns "younger women," in his epistle to Timothy (1 Timothy v. 14-15), of their danger in giving "occasion to THE ADVERSARY to speak reproachfully; for some are already TURNED ASIDE AFTER SATAN." Peter likewise warns "all of you" to "be sober, be vigilant; because YOUR ADVERSARY THE DEVIL, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: WHOM RESIST stedfast in the faith" (1 Peter v. 8-9). James speaks of "THE DEVILS, ALSO, who believe and tremble" (James ii. 19); and declares that "an evil tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity," which is "SET ON FIRE OF HELL"—thus tracing all speech that defiles and hurts the good, to its origin in the "spirits of devils." John writes to "young men" who are "strong," and in whom "the word of God abideth," rejoicing that they "HAVE OVERCOME THE WICKED ONE" (1 John ii. 14). He also says, "He that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and THAT WICKED ONE TOUCHETH HIM NOT" (1 John v. 18). He speaks of those who are "CHILDREN OF THE DEVIL" (1 John iii. 10); and warns the "children of God" against lying "spirits," and "false prophets," who DENY that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh;" telling them that "this is that SPIRIT OF ANTICHRIST, whereof ye have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world" (1 John iv. 1-3).

Again I observe, in passing, this is the sin which makes Unitarianism an open door, and broad highway, into Spiritualism: for the denial of Jesus as the Christ, God's anointed and eternal Son, is a common article of faith with both. As James puts it, in a passage already alluded to, the Unitarians, who say they believe in one God, are in agreement with the Spiritualists, who believe in many devils—"Thou believest there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also

believe and tremble." Fatal and false is the acknowledgment of God which rejects faith in the divinity of His Son! But I continue.

That the warfare of the Christian is to be against the powers of hell, is most surely made clear by these teachings of the Spirit of God.

Paul said, when addressing Agrippa, that it was for that purpose Jesus had sent him forth, giving his commission in these words:—"I SEND THEE to open their eyes, and TO TURN THEM FROM DARKNESS TO LIGHT, and FROM THE POWER OF SATAN UNTO GOD, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in Me" (Acts xxvi. 14-18). And truly he could say, "I was not disobedient:" for he went forth, and from Jerusalem to Athens, and from Athens to Rome, he fought in many cities and lands, for thirty years, amidst countless devils, with "THE PRINCE OF THE POWER OF THE AIR, the SPIRIT that now worketh in the children of disobedience" (Ephesians ii. 2). His courage never failed; and although, at the time he wrote these words, he was an "ambassador in bonds," awaiting a martyr's death and crown, in prison at Rome, yet he demanded prayer for "utterance," that he might "speak boldly, as I ought to speak" (Ephesians vi. 19-20). And, although he said "no man stood by me" when he stood before the heathen tyrant who "sacrificed to devils," yet he could say "*the Lord stood with me and strengthened me,* . . . and I WAS DELIVERED OUT OF THE MOUTH OF THE LION"—the Devil—who would have fain made his heart to fear by his demoniac roaring. And it is with the divinely-inspired words of that glorious hero, who shortly after "finished his course," and received his "crown of righteousness," that I will close this section of my argument. They are the words of the Spirit of God to the Church in this, as in that, day:—"Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against THE WILES OF THE DEVIL. For our wrestling is NOT AGAINST FLESH AND BLOOD, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, AGAINST THE SPIRITUAL HOSTS OF WICKEDNESS in the heavenly [the upper air] places" (Ephesians vi. 11-12).

These solemn words must close the proofs in support of the third portion of my second observation; and I submit that its truth is fully proved from these inspired Scriptures, to whose authority every true Christian owes allegiance.

I now observe (3) that the Scriptures declare that this conflict with evil spirits is to increase in intensity until the latter times, when these "spirits" will put forth mightier and subtler powers, and make a determined effort to possess themselves of the whole world, and of every soul therein.

The prophecies in the New Testament afford, clearly and

definitely, conclusive proof of this observation. I quote but three of these, as being sufficient:—

The first is in 1 Timothy iv. 1-2:—"But the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, GIVING HEED TO SEDUCING SPIRITS AND DOCTRINES OF DEVILS, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron; FORBIDDING TO MARRY, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God created to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and know the truth." This prophecy is fulfilled in Spiritualism in its main features; and I point to pp. 47-49, in confirmation especially of that clause "forbidding to marry," and to my letters generally, as exposing "doctrines" which are so foul and fiendishly wicked, that they must be those of "devils." Instance p. 8, where "virtue" and "vice," a "lie" and the "truth," are taught by the "spirits" to be of equal value—to be, in fact, not words conveying opposite ideas, but words conveying identical ideas, as in the following expressions:—"WHAT IS CALLED EVIL IS GOOD; A LIE IS A TRUTH INTRINSICALLY; VICE AND VIRTUE, TOO, ARE BEAUTIFUL IN THE EYES OF THE SOUL; VIRTUE IS GOOD, AND SIN IS GOOD."

The next passage to which I refer is in 2 Thessalonians ii. 3-12, where, after saying that ere "the day of the Lord" comes there must be a falling away first, and the Man of Sin be revealed, the Son of Perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God." This has surely been fulfilled in the triumph of the "seducing spirits" who have long ruled the apostate Church of Rome, and who, on 18th July, 1870, promulgated the diabolical doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. By that doctrine, as defined in the Constitution "*Pastor Aeternus*," chapters 3 and 4, that infallibility is defined as making the Pope the "ONE SUPREME PASTOR" with "THE ENTIRE AND SUPREME POWER OF JURISDICTION," and "THE ABSOLUTE FULLNESS OF THIS SUPREME POWER;" and that, therefore, the "DEFINITIONS OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF ARE UNALTERABLE."

Here is the "Man of Sin" revealed! He has approved of Mgr. Berteaud saying, "The Father and the Pope may have, and probably have, secrets between them in which Christ does not participate, and thus *it is practically safer to go to the Pope than to Christ*, for, WHEN THE POPE SPEAKS, it is more than Christ speaking, IT IS GOD THE FATHER HIMSELF." He has allowed Cardinal Manning to say that he, the Pope, may rightly say:—"I CLAIM TO BE THE SUPREME JUDGE AND DIRECTOR OF THE CONSCIENCES OF MEN; *I am the sole, last SUPREME JUDGE OF WHAT IS RIGHT AND WRONG.*" He has allowed a newspaper, published under his own direction, in Rome—the *Civiltà Cattolica*—to say:—"WHEN THE POPE REFLECTS, IT IS GOD WHO THINKS IN

HIM." Hence he is seen to be, as prophesied, "sitting in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God."

But, associated with him, in these latter days (see verses 8 and 9) there is to be revealed "THE LAWLESS ONE, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of His mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of His coming; even he WHOSE COMING IS ACCORDING TO THE WORKING OF SATAN, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that are perishing." I suggest that this describes SPIRITUALISM accurately.

I would further draw attention to another prophecy, which seems to bear out this interpretation.

I allude to the passage in the Book of Revelation xvi. 13-16, to which I have also referred at page 13 of this pamphlet, but again quote here as necessary to this argument. It is part of that which happens after the "sixth vial" is poured out upon the river Euphrates, which dries up; and which symbol is generally held to apply to our days, and the rapid drying up of the Turkish Empire in the East, which is going on daily. Then the inspired vision of "things to come" continues:—"And I saw coming out of the mouth of the Dragon, and out of the mouth of the Beast, and out of the mouth of the False Prophet, THREE UNCLEAN SPIRITS, as it were frogs: for THEY ARE SPIRITS OF DEVILS, working signs; which go forth unto the kings of the whole world, to gather them together unto the War of the great day of God, the Almighty."

As the DRAGON represents the direct power of Satan, it is probably here that, amongst other forms of Satanic delusion in these days, Spiritualism is foretold, with all its "spirits of devils." The BEAST is generally supposed to represent the Romish Church, and other forms of ecclesiastical corruption; and I have already shown, that at this very time there is a revival of diabolical pride and imposture. The FALSE PROPHET, who comes last, doubtless refers to Mohammedanism; and the prospects of a revival of Moslem fanaticism throughout the East are said to be many—some of them, as in Egypt, are already apparent. Hence, it seems to me that Spiritualism, as one powerful form of this prophesied going-forth of "the spirits of devils," was to be expected about this time—and HERE IT CERTAINLY IS, a most dangerous ally to all the other existing delusions imposed upon men by "seducing spirits."

But, even if my application of these prophecies be incorrect in some particulars, I submit humbly that my third observation is none the less proved, and that a most desperate conflict is lying before the Church with "the spirits of devils." The utmost courage, vigilance, wisdom, faith, and power are needed at this crisis; and to her Lord the Church must turn her eyes and prayers:

for only by the "breath of His mouth, and the manifestation of His coming," can these demon hosts be overcome, and brought "to nought."

And now I close this introduction.

I am very sensible of its many defects ; but it is all I could accomplish in the brief time at my disposal for its composition.

Yet, I trust that it will promote the glory of God, and the welfare of man, awakening many to a sense of their danger, and arousing a spirit of determination upon the part of the Church of Christ in Australia, to resist the advancing tide of SPIRITUALISM in all its seducing forms.

SPIRITUALISM lies, I submit, UNMASKED in these pages, imperfect though they are. And, when the monster is stripped, what is seen ? I can only reply in the inspired words—"SEDUCING SPIRITS AND DOCTRINES OF DEVILS."

What, then, shall be done ? "When THE ENEMY shall come in like a flood, THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD shall lift up a standard AGAINST HIM !" (Isaiah lix. 19). In whose hands shall this standard be placed ? "Who is she that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners ?" (Song of Solomon vi. 10). 'Tis the Church of Christ ; and she alone can lift up the Royal Standard, and carry it on to victory. May every soldier of her army in this fair Australian land "put on the whole armour of God," and withstand "the spiritual hosts of wickedness," who are now flooding our cities with every vice, and destroying every virtue.

Lord Jesus, come !

Again this earth by sin oppressed,
By demons from beneath possessed—
Some dark and foul, as hell and night,
And some transformed, like sons of light—
Usurp Thy throne within the heart,
And bid men choose the evil part.

Lord Jesus, come !

Lord Jesus, come !

Thine answer sweet our spirits hear,
It soothes our grief, we cannot fear ;
It came to him on Patmos' isle,
Who loved and lived on earth awhile ;
It comes to us,—"I QUICKLY COME."
Yea, "Even so, Lord Jesus, come !"

LORD JESUS, COME !

It is with very much reluctance that I obtrude upon the public attention, as an appendix to this introduction, some words of explanation concerning matters of personal concern, which Mr.

Walker has seen fit to bring forward in his letter of 20th February. The passage to which I refer will be found on page 17.

Mr. Walker endeavours to justify his reference to my affairs, by complaining of my having described him as "a most audacious infidel mercenary." But readers will see, on page 6, that I applied that term justly to him, in a *moral* sense generally, and not specially in a *pecuniary* sense, as he implies that I did. But, like a naughty boy, he thought he had got some hard "stones" to throw at my reputation. He will find though, that I do *not* live in "a glass house;" and that his "stones" have done me no damage: for they are only the mud of falsehood, which will not stick.

It will be observed that Mr. Walker makes two statements.

The first is, that he has been told that I have collected £20,000 for to build a church, in which I am to preach; and the second, that I have received very considerable sums of money for preaching.

Both of these statements, which he has taken the responsibility of repeating from hearsay, are absolutely false.

I might content myself with that reply, and say no more; but, since I have heard of wide-spread calumnies concerning these matters having obtained currency, by means of "lying spirits," not only here, but in South Australia and New South Wales, I take this opportunity of placing both my friends and enemies throughout these colonies in possession of some facts.

First, as to my having *collected* £20,000 to build a church. This "peculiarly spiritualistic" fiction owes its origin, doubtless, to the fact which was publicly announced on 12th August, 1880, in Sydney, that I had been *promised* a sum of £21,000 to build a Free Christian Tabernacle, in which to continue and establish the Free Christian Mission, which I conducted for nearly three years in theatres and public halls, and in other ways, in that city. But it remains until this day *an unfulfilled promise*; and is likely to continue so: for the person who made it has proved to be a swindler and an impostor. He came to me with most respectable credentials, which he had secured by a successful course of imposture elsewhere. He deceived some of the shrewdest men of business in London, Adelaide, and Sydney, by means of forged legal documents, letters written by confederates in the United States and in England, and in many other ways. Amongst my companions in affliction, through him, are bankers, land agents, lawyers, manufacturers, and tradesmen—and, in one instance, he lived for seven months, after his return to England, with persons of wealth and station, amongst whom he passed for a gentleman of large prospective property. He "died" in Paris last year, according to memorial mourning cards which he caused to be issued; but he has, it is said, come to life again, within the last

few weeks, in Queensland, where he made some attempts to practice his vile profession. He reminds me much of the "Diakka" to whom I have referred in the foregoing pages ; and I suppose A. J. Davis and Mr. Walker would agree to define him as "an unbalanced, not an evil person." The Police, however, by whom he is "wanted," differ seriously from the Spiritualists on such matters, as I am afraid William Henry Quintun Holding, or whatever he now calls himself, will find some day. The Lord have mercy upon him. He has in some ways greatly impeded me in the work to which I have consecrated my life, and caused me not a little sorrow ; but the Lord has sustained me, amidst a time of severe trial consequent upon his robberies from myself, and, what I have felt still more keenly, his robberies from dear friends in Sydney, and elsewhere. "But the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." And with the Lord I leave this matter. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"

As to the second statement, a very few words will suffice. It has not even a shadow of fact to rest its untruth upon. My kind and devoted friend, the Treasurer of my late Mission in Sydney, with whose name and address I can furnish doubters, could inform Mr. Walker that, although I preached for years to large audiences in that city, the income barely sufficed to cover the Mission expenses, leaving *me* usually nothing, and sometimes a little less.

I trust that an indulgent public will not grudge me this liberty of explaining these most painful personal matters ; and will remember, that this necessity was thrust upon me by Mr. Walker's insinuations.

It is the first explanation I have made of a matter in which many throughout Australia are interested, and it is likely to be the last. I have no reason to feel ashamed of my part in these matters, however much I have had reason to feel grief and disappointment at the interruptions to work amongst those whom, for more than seven years, I loved and lived for, in Sydney. I cannot, at present, see all God's "reasons why" for those trials, but I am glad that I can say from my heart, "Thy will be done."

It only remains for me to add, that this pamphlet has been printed at the request, and at the entire cost, of friends in this city. On their behalf, I desire to inform the public, that the net proceeds of its sale will be devoted to the funds of Dr. Singleton's

"Temporary Home for Friendless and Fallen Women" in Collingwood, an institution which has done, and is doing, to my certain knowledge, a work of the noblest kind, with, in many cases, the most gratifying temporal and eternal results.

JOHN ALEX. DOWIE.

MELBOURNE, 11th April, 1882.

SPIRITUALISM UNMASKED.

HAWTHORN, 6th February, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—In connection with our conversation, would you have any objections to enter into a public discussion on the following:—You to affirm “that Orthodoxy is conducive to morality and progress,” and Mr. Thomas Walker, who is now in Melbourne, to affirm “that Infidelity is conducive to morality and progress?”—Yours very truly,

A. D. S.

Rev. J. A. Dowie, Coffee Palace,
Collins-street, Melbourne.

VICTORIA COFFEE PALACE, Collins-street,
Melbourne, 6th February, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—Your note received. Permit me to ask, does this challenge to meet Mr. Thomas Walker proceed from him, or those who think with him in any degree, or is it simply a personal inquiry on your own part?

I have hitherto declined to enter upon public discussions of this kind; and, whilst I have not altered in my disinclination for such tournaments as they have been generally conducted, I am deeply sensible of the absolute necessity of dealing with this subject in some public way as early as I can find convenient.

If, however, there ever should be a public debate on “Spiritualism,” in which I should take a part, I should wish the question differently stated to the proposal you have made. Instead of discussing “Is orthodox Christianity, or Infidelity, conducive to morality and progress?” it would be better to confine the discussion to one question, and to define the nature of that question, and the limits within which it should be discussed, as clearly and carefully as possible.

If the question were—“Do the phenomena and teachings of ‘Modern Spiritualism’ warrant the conclusion that they will

promote the intellectual, moral, social, and spiritual welfare of mankind?" I should, under certain circumstances, be prepared to take the negative. But I bind myself to no course of action by this note. I simply await an answer to my first question.

With sincere desires for your highest welfare—I am, faithfully yours,

JOHN ALEX. DOWIE.

Mr. A. D. S., Hawthorn.

HAWTHORN, 7th February, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—I have received yours of the 6th inst. In answer, I have to state that, after leaving you at the Coffee Palace, I met Mr. Walker, and mentioned to him our conversation. He said, "I would like to meet Mr. Dowie in public debate on the question of morality, freethought, &c." I have sent your letter to me to Mr. Walker, and he will answer the latter part of it.—Yours very truly,

A. D. S.

P.S.—I trust you and he will be able to arrange matters satisfactorily, so that *truth* may prevail.—A.D.S.

6 CAROLINA-TERRACE, Drummond-street,

Carlton, 8th February, 1882.

REV. SIR,—Mr. S — has forwarded me a copy of his letter to you, and your answer thereto, with the request that I will reply to your question and remarks.

In the first place, I believe I am responsible for the challenge to you. Mr. S — and I were talking over various matters, based upon a conversation he had had with you, and whilst doing so, I asked him if you were ready to defend your cause in public. As he did not know, I requested him to ask you the question; and, for the purpose of giving him something to go upon, I worded the two propositions which he sent to you in his letter.

I am glad to see that there is a prospect of your coming forward in defence of your position. It is one of the strongest arguments for Infidelity that its opponents either cannot, or dare not, meet its advocates in the fair field of battle.

You suggest a change in the propositions. Why? I think "Infidelity" includes all you state, and gives you a wider field to work in. Infidelity not only covers Spiritualism, but Rationalism, Materialism, Atheism, Deism, &c., &c. Surely, as a clergyman, you must be convinced that NONE of these are conducive to morality and progress. In the same manner, "Orthodox Christianity" covers every sect, and gives me the same room to work in my field.

The question, to my mind, thus resolves itself:—Are you willing to have the merits of Christianity and Infidelity publicly defended by their respective advocates, under such circumstances that the hearers may compare and judge according to the evidence then adduced.—I remain, yours truly,

THOS. WALKER.

Rev. J. A. Dowie.

VICTORIA COFFEE PALACE, Collins-street,
Melbourne, 10th February, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—Yours of 8th did not reach me until late yesterday. I now clearly understand you to be the author of the proposals contained in Mr. S——'s letter to me of 8th inst.

As the challenge to me arose out of my conversations with Mr. S—— on "Modern Spiritualism," I do not see why I should be asked to enter upon a discussion on "Orthodox Christianity," or "Infidelity," with the numerous *aliases* which you have appended thereto.

In my conversations with Mr. S—— I kept strictly to the point at issue, viz.—"Is Spiritualism good and true, or the opposite?" It is not, therefore, I who change the basis of discussion, but you; and I utterly fail to see that to widen that basis would be conducive to an intelligent controversy, or lead to any clear results.

Allow me to show you how useless such a discussion would be, as that upon which you desire me to enter, upon the basis of your proposals.

Take the first of these, which you propose that I should affirm—"That orthodox Christianity is conducive to morality and progress." Observe—(1) what is "orthodox" would require to be defined, and you might not accept my definition, and as I would not argue upon any other basis, the discussion could not proceed; (2) suppose I failed to prove my beliefs to be that which this proposal affirms them to be, that would not prove Spiritualism, or anything else, to be right; (3) suppose I proved my affirmation, I would not thereby necessarily prove Spiritualism, or anything else, to be wrong; and (4) instead of leading to practical results, it might leave our hearers in a greater confusion than before, if we are merely to stand upon two opposite platforms, as your proposals would place us, to say, unchecked, whatever we pleased upon two distinct systems of thought and life.

Then, take the second proposal, that you should affirm "That Infidelity is conducive to morality and progress."

Observe (1) that the four objections which I have already urged would apply, probably, in your case as in mine; (2) that your

definition of "Infidelity," as covering Spiritualism, Rationalism, Materialism, Atheism, Deism, &c., &c., would present not so much a field for discussion as a number of utterly irreconcilable elements, self-contradictory and absurd, which might justly be labelled chaos and anarchy; (3) the "field to work in" would be so wide, if an attempt were made to contend in it, that we might each work in it for a thousand years and never come within sight or grasp of each other; and (4) the triumph of truth on any one point would be thus rendered almost impossible.

I submit, therefore, that my proposal is definite, and gives ample scope. Spiritualism must stand or fall upon its own merits or demerits, as must everything else in religious philosophy. If it needs Rationalism, Materialism, and Atheism to support it, and keep it in countenance, then its origin, nature, designs, and destiny are self-evident. If you again declare that to be the case, public discussion of its claims would be labour lost: for every mind capable of reasoning must then see that it has no claims, except the right to be at once rejected.

Although I still reserve my right to decline to enter upon a public discussion of the claims of "Spiritualism" *per se*, yet I am inclined to do so on the basis I have suggested, or on any modification of it which might be more acceptable to you and equally advantageous to the cause of truth and righteousness.—I am, faithfully yours,

JOHN ALEX. DOWIE.

Mr. Thomas Walker, 6 Carolina-terrace, Drummond-street, Carlton.

6 CAROLINA-TERRACE, Drummond-street,
Carlton, 11th February, 1882.

REV. SIR,—Your letter to hand. Though the challenge arose out of a conversation you had with Mr. S——, when it reached you it was of a definite nature, and accurately expressed the issue there is between us as public men. You are advocating Christianity; I am spreading Infidelity: are you ready to have the merits of the two compared? I fail to see that your objections to the subjects I proposed are valid.

I.—I promise you that I will agree to your definition of orthodoxy, providing it includes these dogmas:—(1.) That Jesus Christ was miraculously conceived; (2.) That he was divine in a sense that no other men are; (3.) That he came on earth to die to save sinners.

II.—If you fail to prove your position, you would fail to prove that Christianity is conducive to morality and progress.

III.—If you did prove your position, you *would* prove that

Christianity is conducive to morality and progress, which is all that you would require to do by such an affirmation.

IV.—It would lead to very practical results if you proved your position. I and many others would turn Christians. If you did not prove your affirmation, the results would still be practical, inasmuch as it would show that Christianity always gets the worst in a fair encounter.

The same may be said of the objections to the second proposal.

I.—The definition of Infidelity that I should make I am pretty sure you would agree with. It would include, for instance, these statements:—(1.) That the Bible is not the Word of God; (2.) That it is not inspired in a sense that Shakespeare is not; (3.) That the Bible is chiefly the product of an *ignorant* and *barbarous* people; (4.) That Jesus (if his character be historical) was simply and only a man; (5.) That the “plan of salvation” was a mistake.

II.—I think “Spiritualism, Rationalism, Materialism, Atheism, Deism, &c., &c.,” though incongruous with each other, are all opposed to Christianity, and I am prepared to show that they are, all of them, more conducive to morality and progress than Christianity is.

III.—You are mistaken about the field being so wide that we should never come within sight of each other. I promise you I will not lose sight of you if once the discussion be brought about.

IV.—You say “the triumph of truth on any one point would be thus rendered impossible.” Surely if you proved that Christianity was conducive to morality and progress, and I failed to prove that Infidelity was, the victory for truth (if it be on your side) would be complete on every point.

“If Spiritualism needs Rationalism, Materialism, and Atheism to support it,” &c., “public discussion of its claims would be labour lost, for every mind capable of reasoning must then see that *it has no claims, except the right to be at once rejected.*”

Surely this is a strange piece of reasoning. Without asserting that Spiritualism does require these supports, I venture to think that even *Atheism* has the right to be HEARD before being rejected, and that whether it be tenable or not is a matter of evidence.

I may tell you that I am, or believe myself to be, a Rationalist; as far as Materialism goes, I am a Materialist; and, so far as *your* God is concerned, I am an Atheist.—I remain, yours truly,

THOS. WALKER.

Rev. J. A. Dowie.

VICTORIA COFFEE PALACE, Collins-street east,
Melbourne, 13th February, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—Yours dated 11th reached me to-day. It is with no desire to be personally offensive that I am compelled to

characterize it as a jumble of illogical nonsense, subtle cunning, and daring misrepresentation—a mixture which scarcely deserves, and is hardly capable of, being seriously answered.

You evidently wish to make it appear that *I* am evading a fair inquiry into, and am afraid to attempt the defence of, my beliefs; whereas it is you who are shirking from the position of defender of the “spiritualistic” faith, which you were very naturally called upon by Mr. S—— to assume, and which you are paid by the Victorian Association of Spiritualists publicly to undertake in this city. My beliefs are not in question. If I were to enter upon a defence of my faith, it would not be with such a controversialist as you, who have evidently either no regard for, or no capacity to perceive, what is true and righteous, since you avow yourself to be ready to advocate utterly irreconcilable and even antagonistic systems of belief. You act as does a mercenary soldier who is prepared to fight under any flag, and betray any cause, so long as he can sell his sword to the best advantage, and indulge in his passion to ravage and destroy. This is clearly your true character as a disputant. You are asked by one who trusts in you as an honest and competent champion of Spiritualism to help him in a contest with me on that subject, and thereupon you rush into the arena and loudly demand that I shall discuss with you on the one hand “orthodox Christianity,” and on the other Infidelity, Spiritualism, Materialism, Rationalism, Atheism, Deism, and a host of anonymous foes of God and man whom you vaguely hint at as “&c., &c.” You ask me to fight upon two distinct platforms at the same moment, I to affirm one thing, and you to affirm a dozen other things, which is equivalent to asking us to travel upon two parallel lines which can never meet. Then, when I say this is manifestly unfair, and would be most undoubtedly useless, and invite you to keep to the point at issue, “Is Spiritualism good and true, or the opposite?” you rush again into the arena, shouting, in effect, “Oh! you are afraid. You won’t meet me!” Could any spectacle be more pitiful and absurd? Surely the most foolish of men could penetrate the flimsy bravado which covers your cowardice, and see that your attempt to fix upon me a charge of evasion has miserably failed.

You are driven to admit my charge that the Infidelity which you were prepared to defend covers systems of belief and morals which are “incongruous with each other;” but still you declare, “I am prepared to show that they are all of them more conducive to morality and progress than Christianity.” Could any assertion more clearly prove your controversial dishonesty, your logical imbecility, or your moral incompetence to discuss any question of morality than these words do? You are certainly a most audacious infidel mercenary.

You are willing to prove Spiritualism and Rationalism on the one side, which profess to trace all things to a spiritual and reasonable origin; and yet, on the other, are willing to prove Materialism, which traces the origin of all things to soulless natural forces and unintelligent matter, to be systems of thought equally conducive to morality and progress. Do your followers really swallow such absolute and impudent nonsense, as that it is equally good for a man to believe that he is a clod of earth, as it is for him to believe that he is a rational and immortal being?

Then you are willing to prove that Atheism, which says there is no God, and Deism, which says there is a God, are equally conducive to morality and progress. Do you and your followers really believe it is equally good for a man to believe that he is the creation and offspring of an eternal God, upon whom he is dependent and to whom he is responsible, as it is for him to believe the opposite—that he came from nowhere, belongs to nobody, and need care for nothing?

Do you imagine that all men are liars and fools, that you should even dare to insult the common sense of mankind by presenting yourself before the world as a friend of morality and progress, and yet call upon men to follow you in such false and immoral teachings?

What would men think, if a politician were to claim their suffrages on the ground that he was wholly a free trader, and yet wholly a protectionist, wholly in favour of public economy, and yet wholly in favour of public plunder, wholly in favour of making good laws, and yet wholly in favour of abolishing all laws, &c.?

They would, of course, say the man was a rogue or a fool; and, if he persisted in his craze, that the only fit place for him was a prison or a lunatic asylum.

But how much more serious is it when a man stands deliberately before his fellow men, as you do, openly avowing himself to be an Apostle of Falsehood, prepared to defend any system, no matter how false, if by that means he can injure or impede the progress of Christian truth, in its beneficent efforts to set all men free from the fearful miseries produced by diabolical errors in thought and practice.

I have, as you probably know, for several years done what I could, on many public occasions, to expose and denounce "Modern Spiritualism" as a foe to God and man; and this correspondence only confirms my conviction that it is destructive of all morality and true progress.

Your confession that you are a Spiritualist, Rationalist, Materialist, Atheist, Deist, &c., all rolled into one under the name of "Infidel," is only an additional proof of what I have long seen, that in "Modern Spiritualism" the world has a system

embracing all error, uncleanness, and malice—a system which could only be the production of “the spirits of devils.”

Well might one of your own prophetesses, Emily Kislingbury, Secretary to the British National Association of Spiritualists, say of Australian and universal Spiritualism what she did of American, after her return from a visit to the United States—“Most persons of good sense and of high moral character, and who value the peace and purity of their homes, refuse to associate themselves with Spiritualists as a body, or to identify themselves with the movement”—(see the report of her address in the *London Spiritualist* of 14th December, 1877).

How can it be otherwise? Your own letters conclusively prove that you teach mental, moral, social, and spiritual chaos and anarchy, and in that respect you are quite consistent with the designs of its author.

You evidently agree with another of your prophets, Dr. A. B. Child, of Boston, U.S.A., who, in his filthy book, “Whatever is, is Right,” teaches (page 6)—“Vice and virtue, too, are beautiful to the eyes of the soul. Both are right and in place.” Again, at page 18, he says:—“A lie is a truth intrinsically; it holds a lawful place in creation; it is a necessity.” Again, on the same page, “Every opinion is right,” is proclaimed to be true, whilst, at page 103, the absolute uncertainty of every opinion is taught, where he says:—“Spiritualism has no creed; nor can it have. The truly progressive soul has new convictions every day, so that the creed of yesterday would not answer for to-day.” Again, at page 19, defending positive immorality, he writes words which I am ashamed to repeat:—“The degradation of prostitution is a phantom of materialism that belongs to self-righteousness; that is produced by the fictitious distinctions of self-excellence; prostitution, so-called, is in reality an undisguised condition of life—an open expression of the elements of existence that are spontaneous and natural, and that are antagonistic to material glory.” Again, at page 24, in answer to the question, “Does impurity exist in the soul?” he replies, “No; impurity exists only in matter, and is only palpable to material perception.” Yet, with inconceivable effrontery, he even denies that exception, and says, in the same paragraph, “Soul perception discovers no impurity anywhere in the creation of God,” thereby denying its existence even in matter, which is certainly a part of creation. Again, at page 27, this priest and prophet of evil, of your own order, says:—“What is called evil is good. Nothing is evil in reality. Good is everything, for everything is good. Virtue is good, and sin is good; every human being is good, and every human action is good.” Then in answer, on page 35, to the question, “Which is the way that leads to heaven?” this incarnate Beelzebub replies, “There is no way in which the soul goes forth in life that does not lead

directly to heaven. Not a single path on earth is trod that does not lead the soul to God. The clean and the unclean, the rebel and the saint, each one goes in the way the soul directs, and every way points to heaven." Hence this procurer for hell has no shame in writing, at page 45 :—" Lucy, the courtesan, is led in an avenue of happiness where her inclinations immediately direct, with the deeper longings of her soul held for a time in check ; and her sister Frances, the faithful wife and mother, in another avenue of happiness, where her inclinations lead." It is no surprise, therefore, to find, at page 67, a chapter headed " Evil does not exist," in which he teaches that " evil is only the natural operation of things for the production of good."

An application of this doctrine is made to the crime of murder, at page 71, which is quite in keeping with the teaching of his and your common master, the devil, of whom the Lord Jesus truly said—" He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him." Your fellow-worker says :—" Murder has no influence upon the soul ; it is a thing of the material world in its influences. Every murder that ever was committed has been inevitable ; in the bosom of nature [which he elsewhere declares is God] has existed the lawful cause of which murder has been the effect. The causes of nature, and the effects of nature, are always right." It follows, therefore, that since every murder is a lawful effect of a lawful cause, murder is always right, in the opinion of this spiritualistic Thug, whose doctrines would fain destroy both soul and body.

The majestic beauty of every vice and crime is thus an article of spiritualistic faith. Hence it is taught that to do wickedly hastens the development of the soul and its true progress, as is seen at p. 103, where he writes :—" The greatest wickednesses are but the damps of life, that are produced by soul growth, and thereby soften and prepare the soul sooner for the development of new truth."

To go further with this guide would be impossible, for he has now conclusively proved, to all who are under the guidance of the spirits of devils, that earth will only be pure when it is ruled from hell, and that it is the right and duty of every man so disposed, to lie, to murder, to steal, and to commit every wickedness which the powers and principalities of evil can suggest ; nor has God or man, in his judgment, any right to stay or impede in any way the onward march of this system, which you declare is " conducive to morality and progress."

Now, lest you, or anyone who may read these lines, should suppose that Dr. A. B. Child's book, from which I have quoted so largely, is only the expression of an isolated spiritualist's views, permit me to add that he appends to his volume ninety-six pages of remarks upon it by leading spiritualists and spiritualistic papers,

generally approving his doctrines, and rejoicing that they have found expression.

Amongst these, E. Annie Kingsbury declares—"Its philosophy is to me very beautiful; it is substantial, satisfying, and divine; and it will assuredly benefit everyone who studies and appropriates it."

Mrs. Emma Hardinge Britten writes also a letter, by Dr. Child's request, "expressly for a place in the pages of this book," and, in a wearisome rhapsody of grandiloquent verbiage, she tells us what her "guardian angel" told her about this book, when she "read it in the dim twilight"—a very bad time, indeed, for reading. Her attendant demon, as was to be expected, very much approved of this diabolical production, and told her that he saw "the gold of God within the human soul," even in those "whose very vices were levers to move the whole;" so "that jails and scaffolds, crimes and virtues, became machinery to coin, at last, the image of God, and stamp it on the saintly soul of man."

Imagine a gang of murderers and robbers standing before a judge in Melbourne, pleading that they were lawfully engaged, when they committed the crimes with which they stand charged, in coining the image of God out of the gold of their vices, and stamping it on the souls of their victims!

Mrs. J. S. Adams, another portress at this gate of hell called Spiritualism, writes in glowing terms of approval, and says:—"Life without evil, so-called, would be anything but desirable—a passive condition, wherein virtue would have no reward, faith no merit, and progress no obstacles to aid the spirit's growth. I sincerely hope that you may be encouraged and strengthened in your noble efforts by the inhabitants of earth, as you have been and now are by the angels of heaven."

Charlotte H. Bowen is prepared to hail Dr. Child as a true Messiah; and, after gushingly declaring that his doctrine "was born within me, with many other beautiful ideas, when I began to unfold interiorly," she continues:—"There are a few wise men who have seen the star just risen in the east, and will assemble to worship it—or rather the principle—'the young Child' over which it stands. So say on, my brother."

Another writer, C. E., says:—"Whatever is, is right," is a comforting doctrine. Of course it destroys the idea that we are free agents. It is fatalism in another form; but fatalism is the only logical doctrine."

Andrew Jackson Davis, the greatest of spiritualistic seers until the advent of this Satanic Messiah, worships the new star also, and writes:—"Yes, in the highest, widest, truest statement, everything is good, is right, is beautiful."

And similar approval is given by many others, of less note individually, to these horrible doctrines.

Then the spiritualistic press approve of it generally. The *Shekinah* welcomes it as being "one of the great steps onward in the new era of unfolded truth." The *Herald of Progress* says :—"Our brother's gospel is comforting to the last degree of heavenly peace." The *Banner of Light* says :—"It is a good symptom that this our day brings forth a book of this character." The *National Standard* says :—"We can commend this book." And, in a French infidel sheet, *La Revue de L'ouest*, the climax of praise is given to Dr. Child's doctrine in these words :—"He has beautifully said, that vice is as legitimate as virtue, and that falsehood is as true as truth."

So, then, here we have your position as a "spiritualist" defined correctly by friendly writers in the front rank of the army of evil, representing fully all its ranks, and its unseen diabolical leaders. And this fact was the reason for my saying that, if you clung to your position, "public discussion of the claims of Spiritualism would be labour lost, for every mind capable of reasoning must then see that it has no claims, except the right to be at once rejected."

Allow me to express my sincere regret that I find your soul in the bondage of such demoniacal fetters, and that you hug your chains and boast of your freedom when you are all the while "led captive by the devil at his will."

I do earnestly pray that you may see your sin and flee to the Rock of Salvation—the eternal Son of God. You are building on the quicksands of sin and death, and you are leading others to build there too. The waters are rising on every side of you ; the last dark night of tempest may be very near at hand. The last fierce storm will beat ere long upon your soul, and your house will fall with an awful crash, amidst the mockery of the fiends who are destroying you, as they did your late companion in sin, John Tyerman, in Sydney, not long ago. I do most earnestly and affectionately entreat you to flee from this worse than Sodom and Gomorrah, mis-called Spiritualism (NIHILISM better describes it), ere it be too late, and that may be very soon. I warn you and your deluded friends, in the inspired words of the Son of God—"Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." Your teachings are at present doing fearful harm. "Your vine is as the vine of Sodom and of the fields of Gomorrah ; your grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter ; your wine is the poison of dragons and the cruel venom of asps" (Deut. xxxii. 32-33). For years I have studied your wicked system, and everywhere I have found its fruits evil and deadly, destroying the fairest homes, the noblest faculties, and sowing the dragon's teeth of every sin and crime—a blight to the individual, a desolation to the family, a hindrance to every virtue, a handmaid to every vice, and a curse to every city and land where it comes.

You closed your last letter by a short declaration of your faith, wherein you say:—"I may tell you that I am, or believe myself to be, a Rationalist; as far as Materialism goes, I am a Materialist; and, so far as your God is concerned, I am an Atheist."

Permit me to say what I am, and why. I am a Christian, resting my hopes for time and eternity upon the eternal Son of God, my Saviour and my King, whose love binds me to His service.

And when I consider how gloriously He has vindicated His claims to be the Lord and Redeemer, by the sacrifice of Himself for a guilty and fallen race, by the purity of His teaching, the sinless beauty of His example, the attraction of His love, and the glorious results which have ever followed obedience to His commands, I find abundant reason to justify my choice.

'Tis Jesus, the Christ of God, who has established the principles of a pure morality, which preserves the home and all its priceless blessings; 'tis Jesus who teaches the sublimity of self-denying love, and bids His followers care for the weak, the orphaned, the poor, the ignorant, the sin-laden, and the sorrow-stricken everywhere; 'tis Jesus who inspires the sublimest heroism and the noblest philanthropy, and the grandest pages of history are those which record the triumphs of His faith—a faith which has led true Christians in every age gladly to toil, to suffer, and to die for their fellow-men; 'tis Jesus who has raised nations from the depths of heathen degradation and ignorance to a high standard of intelligence, and virtue, and true religion—and these triumphs are going on in our day, as witness Fiji and Madagascar, and many other lands; 'tis Jesus who is ever in the van of all true progress—and though His teachings are travestied and dishonoured by the Romish and Greek and other corrupt churches, and though He is opposed by Infidelity and all the hosts of hell, still He goes ever onward, "conquering and to conquer," until every foe of God and man is vanquished, and not an aching sin-oppressed heart or tear-dimmed eye is found. For "all that is beautiful shall abide, and all that is base shall die."

"BEHOLD THE LAMB OF GOD, WHO TAKETH AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD!"

And what has this unclean Spiritualism of yours, and all her attendants, to say in His divine presence—this

"Snaky sorceress that sits
Fast by hell gate, and holds a fatal key?"

Where are her triumphs, where are the blessings she has bestowed, and the deliverances she has wrought for man?

There are none. No, not a single attempt has ever been made by Spiritualism to lessen the sorrows, to cure the spiritual diseases,

to restore the fallen, or to deliver the sin-oppressed amongst men.

Where is the hospital she has founded, and what savage tribe has she civilized and raised from its degradation and superstition?

"By their fruits ye shall know them;" and the only fruits from that tree are corrupt and deadly. She has come robed in false attire, sometimes appearing attractive as an angel of light; but when revealed as she is, she stands, in all her detestable vileness, so loathsome and hateful, that, when she is seen, she is hated and rejected.

Spiritualism, then, can be no other than an emanation from hell. Its advent was foretold by the Spirit of God long ages since, in the First Epistle to Timothy, fourth chapter, and first two verses, in these words:—"Now the Spirit saith expressly, that in later times some shall fall away from the faith, *giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils*, through the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, branded in their own conscience as with a hot iron." That awful brand is on you who teach "doctrines of devils," which cannot be other than the work of "seducing spirits."

Another prophecy in God's inspired word seems to me to apply also to your system, and the revival of other forms of Satanic error. "The dragon" in it probably represents the direct power of Satan himself; "the beast," the corrupt Church of Rome and kindred corruptions; and "the false prophet," Mohammedanism. I identify Spiritualism as emanating directly from "the dragon," in the passage which I now quote from the Book of Revelation, seventeenth chapter, thirteenth and fourteenth verses:—"And I saw, coming out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet, three unclean spirits, as it were frogs: for they are spirits of devils, working signs; which go forth unto the kings of the whole world to gather them together unto the great day of God the Almighty."

Will you not be warned in time, and turn to God from serving these "unclean spirits," into whose fearful bondage you are also enticing by your lies many precious souls? I speak plainly, but, as God knoweth, I do not speak unkindly.

I wish, if it be possible, to open your eyes so that you may see your danger; and, if you persist, I warn you of your doom.

May God in His mercy stop you and your deluded associates in your career of devilry; and may many Christians who are now being tempted by the seductions of Spiritualism to fall away from the faith, remember the solemn warning of their Lord, which is appended to the prophecy from which I last quoted: "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

Trusting that these words may be made useful in awakening you and others to a sense of your perilous condition—I am, faithfully yours,

JOHN ALEX. DOWIE.

Mr. Thomas Walker, 6 Carolina-terrace, Drummond-street, Carlton.

6 CAROLINA-TERRACE, Drummond-street,
Carlton, 20th February, 1882.

REV. SIR,—My last letter evidently ruffled you a little, and stepped upon some one or other of your corns, if I may judge by the number of clerical expletives with which your letter abounds. I had no idea you were so good a Christian before, and that you were so apt at cursing and swearing at those who do not believe with you. It is reported of Jesus that his temper was none of the smoothest when he addressed his enemies, and to them he applied such epithets as “Ye fools and blind,” “Ye serpents,” “Ye hypocrites,” “Ye generation of vipers,” “Ye blind guides,” “Ye are like unto whited sepulchres,” &c., &c. In this respect you have imitated your Master well, if you have not even surpassed him. Were these the days of competition by Christian clergy in the use of foul language and vapid abuse, I would deferentially advise you to be a competitor, for you could not fail to win, at least, a bronze medal.

If my last letter to you be “a jumble of illogical nonsense, subtle cunning, and daring misrepresentation,” how would you characterize yours?

Allow me, again, to point out that my challenge to you was of a definite nature, and that *I called your beliefs in question*. How, then, can you with clerical justice say, “My beliefs are not in question?” They are in question; and I ask you again if you *dare* to defend them? If you will undertake a defence of your orthodoxy, I will undertake a defence of Spiritualism *pure et simple*, since you appear to be so much afraid to meet Infidelity in any other form.

There are three recognized Christian virtues—“Faith, hope, and charity, and the greatest of these is charity.” Will you kindly inform me under which one of these, if any, the following sentences of yours will come?—

“You act as does a mercenary soldier who is prepared to fight under any flag, and betray any cause, so long as he can sell his sword to the best advantage, and indulge in his passion to ravage and destroy.”

“Surely the most foolish of men could penetrate the flimsy bravado which covers your cowardice.”

"Your controversial dishonesty, your logical imbecility, or your moral incompetence to discuss any question of morality."

"You are certainly a most audacious infidel mercenary."

"Absolute and impudent nonsense."

"They would, of course, say the man (to whom I am compared) was a rogue or a fool, and, if he persisted in his craze, that the only fit place for him was a prison or a lunatic asylum."

"Openly avowing himself (myself) to be an Apostle of Falsehood, prepared to defend any system, no matter how false, if by that means he can injure or impede the progress of Christian truth."

"You teach mental, moral, social, and spiritual chaos and anarchy."

"You evidently agree with another of your prophets, Dr. A. B. Child, of Boston, U.S.A., who, in his filthy book," &c.

"Quite in keeping with his and your common master, the devil."

"You are all the while 'led captive by the devil at his will.'"

"Your late companion in sin, John Tyerman."

"I warn you of your doom," &c.

These are all applied to me personally. There are quite as many more applied to others, and to systems of philosophy which, it appears to me, it is evident you do not understand. Think you, sir, that this is of the nature of argument, and that I am to be turned to a religion which, in you, has given rise to such vituperations, by abuse of such a description? To mistake such wholesale libelling for intended argument appears to prove that it is you, and not I, who should be charged with "controversial dishonesty" and "logical imbecility."

Now, let me see for a moment who is guilty of "daring misrepresentation."

1. "You ask me to fight upon two distinct platforms AT THE SAME MOMENT." Where? Point out the passage where I have asked you to do this, from my last letter, or *you*, sir, stand convicted of "daring misrepresentation." Permit me to say that I did nothing of the kind. I asked you to stand and fight upon your platform in defence of your views, and *then* on my platform to attack mine. I am ready to defend my views—are you to defend yours? Such was and is my position, and I confess I can see nothing illogical in it. But to think you could do the two at the same moment—that you could be taking the affirmative and I the affirmative at the same time—is not a thing that I should be guilty of.

2. You say that I loudly demand that you shall discuss with me on "Infidelity, Materialism, Rationalism, Atheism, Deism, and a host of anonymous foes of God and man whom you vaguely hint at as ' &c., &c. ' " Again, I ask you—where? Point out the place,

sir, and quote the very passage, or I shall be obliged to accuse you of "daring misrepresentation." In my challenge to you there were two definite proposals, one of which it was intended you should affirm—viz. : "Resolved that (your) Orthodoxy is conducive to morality and progress ;" and the other I should affirm—viz. : "Infidelity is conducive to morality and progress." Such was my challenge to you ; in reply to which you stated that you could not accept it, for several reasons, one of which was—I might not agree to your definition of Orthodoxy, nor you to my definition of Infidelity.

I pointed out to you that none of your objections were valid ; that I would agree to your definition of Orthodoxy, and that you could scarcely fail to agree to the definition of Infidelity that I made in my last letter. My only reason for mentioning so many "isms" was to show you that the term "Infidelity" was wider than that of "Spiritualism," and gave both of us more room to state our views more fully. Spiritualism, in its present form, is of modern origin ; it, therefore, will not so effectually serve me as will the term "Infidelity," in proving that our progress is *not* due to the influence of Christianity. I was willing to defend Infidelity ; which term "Infidelity" covered the "isms" enumerated, in the same manner that the term "orthodox" covers "the Baptists," "the Wesleyans," "the Ranters," "the Anglicans," "the High Church," "the Low Church," "the Adventists," "the Lutherans," "the Calvinists," "the Roman Catholics," "the Presbyterians"—including all the divisions of this sect—and "others" whom I shall "vaguely hint at as ' &c., &c. ' "—not, of course, forgetting the "Salvation Army." Now, it is not impossible that you may be willing to show that any or all of these sects, covered by the word "orthodox," are better than my belief, and superior to the "Infidelity" which I advocate, without IDENTIFYING yourself with any one of them. You might—might you not?—undertake, consistently and honestly, to show "that the Baptists are better than infidels," "that the Wesleyans are better than infidels," "that the Anglicans are better than infidels," "that the Presbyterians are better than infidels," without being specially either a Baptist, Wesleyan, Anglican, or Presbyterian. You might be a Lutheran, and still show that the orthodoxy of a Wesleyan, Baptist, Anglican, or Presbyterian was more conducive to progress than the heresy of the infidels ; and this, too, without involving yourself in the slightest inconsistency or absurdity. In fact, had a debate to be brought about, and you had to defend orthodoxy, you would be obliged to take this course. Whatever *your* orthodoxy may be, in defending it you would be obliged to defend those points it has in common with the rest of the sects called "orthodox." Should I be justified, because of this fact, in saying of you—"You act as does a mercenary soldier, who is pre-

pared to fight under any flag, and betray any cause, so long as he can sell his sword to the best advantage?" It appears to me I should not. Why, then—when I have only admitted my willingness to take a similar course—should I be so charitably slandered?

3. "You are driven to admit my charge that the Infidelity which you were prepared to defend covers systems of belief and morals 'incongruous with each other;' but still you declare, I am prepared to show that they are all of them more conducive to morality and progress than Christianity."

First of all, I was not *driven* to admit this; and nextly, I did not mention the word "morals" in my statement; and lastly, I was only prepared to show that they were more conducive to morality and progress in the same manner as you might undertake to prove that both Calvin and Wesley did more good for the world than either Voltaire or Charles Bradlaugh have done. Both the *Infralapsarians* and the *Supralapsarians* are orthodox. Yet these systems are incongruous with each other. You, to a certain extent, in defending orthodoxy, would have to defend both the *Infra* and *Supra Lapsarians*. The *Sprinklers* and the *Dippers* are both orthodox, yet their systems of baptism are incongruous with each other. Yet, in defending orthodoxy at all, you would have to defend at least *some* of their orthodoxy. The Lutherans believe in the "real presence" as do the Roman Catholics. The Anglicans and others do not. On this point there is incongruity. Yet in defending orthodoxy you must defend both that of the Lutheran and that of the Anglican. Should I, on this account, be justified in accusing you of "controversial dishonesty," "logical imbecility," and "moral incompetence to discuss any question of morality?" If not, why do you apply these abusive epithets to me for doing what you do every time you defend your cause?

4. "You are certainly a most audacious infidel mercenary." Why, pray? From what portion of my letter have you drawn this *charitable* and *Christian* conclusion? Am I necessarily "an audacious infidel mercenary" because I am willing to prove that your cause rests on insufficient evidence, and has not been conducive to morality and progress, whilst Infidelity has? Are you an "audacious Christian mercenary" because you attack my cause and defend your own? It is reported to me that you have collected £20,000 to build a church for you to preach in, at a certain regularly paid salary. This may not be true, but at all events you cannot complain of not having got money for preaching your views, in no despicable sums. I do not complain of this, but when it is probable that you get more money for preaching your views than I do for preaching mine, it can be nothing short of a "daring misrepresentation" to accuse me of being "an audacious

mercenary infidel." Those who live in glass houses, methinks, "should not throw stones."

But even supposing, for the sake of argument, that I am a "mercenary infidel," does that prove your position and disprove mine? It has nothing to do with the question, sir, and is utterly beneath a man who would fain pass for a "Christian" and a "gentleman." I might be the most "audacious" man and the greatest "mercenary" living, without this enabling you in one whit to prove that "orthodoxy is conducive to morality and progress," or to disprove that Infidelity is. Oh! when will the clergy learn that abuse is no part of an argument?

5. (1) "You are willing to PROVE Spiritualism on the one side and yet, on the other, are willing to PROVE Materialism."
- (2) "Then you are willing to PROVE that Atheism and Deism are *equally* conducive to morality and progress."

I know not, sir, how to characterize such misrepresentation as this. Point me out the very sentence in my letter where I said I was ready to PROVE both Spiritualism and Materialism as *equally* true and conducive to morality. I insist, sir; point me out the very paragraph—the very words—or forever know that you have told a *lie*, either wilfully or in consequence of your "logical imbecility." I shall not apologize for this strong language; for to cover over the truth with the gloss of politeness, and to hide the injustice of your conduct beneath soft words of a double meaning, is in itself to misrepresent the facts. You must either, therefore, produce the paragraph from my letter in which I say, without doubt, that Atheism and Deism are "*equally*" conducive to morality and progress, and that I am ready to undertake the proof of this; or else, as you are a gentleman, you are morally bound to apologize to me for your "daring misrepresentation."

You ask me—"Do you imagine that all men are liars and fools?" As an infidel, I do not; for I may say that the chief characteristic of Infidelity is respect for truth. If I were a Christian, in the orthodox sense, I should be disposed to answer in the affirmative; for should I not therein have the authority of Paul, who himself was one (*vide* Rom. iii. 7) of the former. In this respect, and in a friendly spirit, I would advise you not to follow Paul too closely.

6. "Your CONFESSION that you are a Spiritualist, Rationalist, Materialist, Atheist, Deist, &c., all rolled into one," &c. Will you be kind enough to quote me this "confession" from my letter? No shuffling, sir; quote me the very "confession." Let

me have no constructions of your own, but my words to express such a confession ! This, sir, like the others, is one of your "daring misrepresentations." The nearest statement approaching to a confession that I made in my letter was at the conclusion, where I said, "I am, or believe myself to be, a Rationalist ; as far as *Materialism* goes, I am a Materialist ; and, so far as your God is concerned, I am an Atheist." I simply stated that I was an Atheist to your God, and a Materialist so far as *Materialism* went ; but I did not say that I was both a Deist and an Atheist at one and the same time, and that I held that both Materialism and Spiritualism were equally true.

My position throughout has been this : Atheism may or may not be truer than Deism, but certain it is that both Atheism and Deism have done more good for humanity than has your orthodoxy. I want to defend neither Atheism nor Deism, but I am anxious both to point out and to defend what good they have done, and still are doing, as opposed to the system you advocate. The fact of the matter is, the freedom of thought permitted and encouraged by both Deists (represented by such men as Voltaire and Paine) and Atheists (represented by such men as Lewis, Büchner, Haeckel, and even Bradlaugh) has liberated humanity from the slavery of faith, and opened to them the thousand doors of truth, whilst your orthodoxy has not only, in the past, been the advocate of literal slavery, but has made a serf of every mind, and closed the portals of discovery to the sons of men. It was this field that I was eager to enter upon in a public discussion, but into which field you appear to have no inclination to travel. I was prepared to show the good that all forms of Infidelity have done, and are still calculated to do ; for, encouraging (as they do) the freedom of thought, they enwide the horizon of human knowledge, and open a myriad avenues to aspiration, discovery, and progression. If you are firmly convinced that Infidelity has not done this, but that Christianity has, how comes it that you are so unwilling to even attempt to prove your position, and so willing to abuse me for claiming to be ready to prove mine ?

7. "Your own letters conclusively prove that you teach mental, moral, social, and spiritual chaos and anarchy." Where in my letters have I taught such ? Again I ask you to point out the paragraph.

As to the work of Dr. A. B. Child, it appears to me that you have not the ability or the honesty to understand it aright. There are statements and conclusions in the work with which I cannot agree ; but I venture to affirm that there is more truth in it than there would be in a work of equal size written by yourself to express your own views. And there is more—not one of

the passages you have quoted from his work are *peculiarly* spiritualistic. Pope, who was not a spiritualist, but is claimed by Christians as belonging to them, in his celebrated "Essay on Man," says:—

"All nature is but art unknown to thee,
All chance, direction, which thou canst not see ;
All discord, *harmony* not understood ;
All partial evil, universal good.
And, spite of pride, in erring reason's spite,
One truth is clear—WHATEVER IS, IS RIGHT."

This Dr. Child has elaborated in a moderately large work—in a less poetic manner, it is true, than Pope ; still the conclusions of the two are precisely the same. Why, then, should you specially single out Dr. Child for your abuse, whilst you say not a word about Pope ? But, further, is it not a fact that the Calvinists, who are Christians, believe that God has foreordained everything that happens, and that he has predestined some for heaven and some for hell ? Reasoning from this stand-point, surely what God has foreordained and predestined is right. Does not even the New Testament teach us that everything happens by the will of God, and that out of the same lump of clay he makes one vessel to honour and another to dishonour ? Surely what God does must be right, and since you believe that God does everything, what is it that prevents you from saying, with Paul, Pope, and Child, "Whatever is, is right ?" Remember, I have not ranked myself on the side of the optimists. I have only pointed out to you that you are inconsistent in so maliciously abusing Dr. Child, whilst you allow Pope and Paul, who had the same views in this respect, to escape scot free.

The following quotation which you make, I thoroughly agree with:—"The truly progressive soul has new convictions every day, so that the creeds of yesterday would not answer for to-day." By this we are simply told that the man of progress is constantly acquiring fresh knowledge and adjusting his convictions thereto. There is nothing debasing in such a confession, and I do not wish you ill, but well, when I say that I wish you were possessed of a truly progressive soul, such as Dr. Child has described in the above quotation.

The following is a paragraph which you say you are ashamed to repeat:—"The degradation of prostitution is a phantom of Materialism that belongs to self-righteousness ; that is produced by fictitious distinctions of self-excellence ; prostitution so-called is in reality an undisguised condition of life—an open expression of the elements of existence that are spontaneous and natural, and that are antagonistic to material glory." I am not going to defend the opinions in the above paragraph, and I

will only so far speak in their defence as to say they are more charitable to the "fallen" than any I have heard from the Christian clergy. But, sir, it ill-becomes you to talk about *shame* at the repetition of the obscene and the unchaste. You preach from a book, and you get your living by a book that contains passages to which, for obscenity and vulgarity, the passage you have quoted can bear no comparison at all. I am forced by your letter, in self-defence, to quote a few passages from the very book you base your faith upon, and which is the mainstay of your position. Gen. xxxviii. 8-10:—"And Judah said unto Onan, Go in unto thy brother's wife, and marry her, and raise up seed to thy brother. And Onan knew that the seed should not be his; and it came to pass when he went in unto his brother's wife that . . . lest he should give seed to his brother. And the thing which he did displeased the Lord: wherefore he slew him also." Read the whole of the chapter, and then ask yourself if Dr. Child has advocated anything more horrible than the actual conduct of the villain Judah!

The case of the daughters of Lot you know; you know of the wives and concubines of Solomon, and of the adultery of David, the man after God's own heart. Was Dr. Child any worse than any of these wretches?

Numbers xxxi. 17-18:—"Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women-children that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." Thirty-two thousand virgins were given to the soldiers, of which the tribute of the Lord was thirty-two. Is there anything more horrible in Dr. Child's work than this? If there be, I should be thankful if you would point it out. Is the coarseness of Ezekiel anywhere surpassed by Dr. Child? Find me a passage in the work you have cited more abominably filthy than the following passage, and I will give in. Jer. iii. 9:—"And it came to pass, through the lightness of her . . . that she defiled the land, and committed . . . with stones and with stocks." Every crime, sir, which has disgraced humanity I can point out to you as commanded and sanctioned by the God of the Old Testament—murder, rape, incest, theft, and lying are all stamped with Divine authority in the book on which your orthodoxy rests. Why, then, do you "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel," and rave at the "mote" that is in the eye of your brother whilst you are unconscious of the beam in your own?

If you will consult H. T. Buckle's "History of Civilization," you will find that the main opinions of Dr. Child are substantiated by evidence, for, in his chapter on "Resources for Investigating History," Mr. Buckle supports these positions:—

"Murder is committed with as much regularity, and bears as uniform a relation to certain known circumstances as do the movements of the tides and the rotation of the seasons.

"Every year, there not only take place nearly the same number of murders, but even the instruments by which they are committed are employed in the same proportion.

"Suicide is merely the product of the general condition of society, and that the individual felon only carries into effect what is a necessary consequence of preceding circumstances.

"In a given state of society, a certain number of persons must put an end to their own life. This is the general law; and the special question as to who shall commit the crime depends, of course, upon special laws, which, however, in their total action must obey the large social law to which they are all subordinate."

Read the whole of the chapter, for I am of opinion that the evidence he gives is pretty nigh irresistible. Why don't you abuse Buckle, then, who maintains that in a given state of society there must be a certain proportion of crime? This is precisely the position of Dr. Child. Dr. Child says everything takes place by *Law*—that it follows by necessity from the existence of causes sufficient to produce it. He, therefore, on that account, and no other, calls it "right." But, mark you, it is only right—*id est*, lawful—for the time being, so long as conditions remain the same. Let me, then, compare a statement or two of Dr. Child's with Henry Thomas Buckle's:—

DR. CHILD.

"For every deed of human life *there has been a cause sufficient to produce the deed*, whether the deed has been called good or evil."—Page 2.

"Life's perturbations, its conflicts, and its sufferings, that come to us of what we call evil, are lawful necessities."—Page 137.

BUCKLE.

"When we perform an action, we perform it *in consequence of* some motive or motives . . . those motives are *the results of* some antecedents; and that, therefore, if we were acquainted with the whole of the antecedents, and with all the laws of their movements, we *could with unerring certainty predict* the whole of their immediate results."—Page 18.

"The actions of men, being determined solely by their antecedents, *must have a character of uniformity*—that is to say, must, under precisely the same circumstances, always issue in precisely the same results."—Page 20.

You will thus perceive that Buckle is quite as strong in the assertion of the supremacy of law as is Dr. Child. And not only does he maintain that "law" is supreme, but that its actions or results—or, more properly speaking, the "facts" that it expresses—are in "order," and never inconsistent. We will carry the comparison a little further.

DR. CHILD.

"It sees the manifestation of every human soul, whether good or bad, as being the necessary *result of a certain condition*, in which condition is to be found a *natural cause* that produced the good or bad action."—Page 134.

"Nature will always balance extremes by extremes."—Page 121.

BUCKLE.

"To those who have a steady conception of the regularity of events, and have firmly seized the great truth—that the actions of men, *being guided by their antecedents*, are in reality *never inconsistent*, but, however capricious they may appear, only form part of one vast scheme of universal order."—Page 33.

"The activity of one motive is corrected by the activity of another, *for to every vice there is a corresponding virtue*."—Page 225.

I have put in italics the chief points which I wish you to notice.

If Dr. Child is to be as much abused for reducing all phenomena to law, what are you going to do with Buckle?

Have you read the work of J. S. Mill on "Logic?" Does not the work reduce both physical and mental phenomena, *equally*, to the operation of law? In this respect, though infinitely more exact and philosophic than Dr. Child, he stands upon the same platform with him. Mill, however, was not a Spiritualist, but an Atheist. How are you going to abuse him?

Max Müller, a warm friend of the late Dean Stanley, and avowedly a Christian, though a little heterodox, speaking in praise of the primitive Aryans, said, in his Hibbert Lectures:—"Their impulsive force would not rest till it had beaten into the minds of the fathers of our race the deep and indelible impression that '*all is right*,' and filled them with a hope, and more than a hope, that '*all will be right*.'" (Again I have put the point in italics.) Is not this the position of Dr. Child? What store of abuse, then, have you for Max Müller?

Stuart Glennie, in his work entitled "Pilgrim Memories," states, as an accepted fact of psychology, "that all mental action whatever is but an aspect of a certain mechanical action." He reduces everything to law. So far, he agrees with Dr. Child, though he was a denouncer of Spiritualism. What favourite "epithet" would you apply to him?

I could go on for hours, quoting from recognized works of genius and learning, to show that the opinions of Dr. Child—that the universe is governed by law, and that everything, for the time being, is right, because inevitable—had been held by all classes of minds, from Zeno to Mill, from Paul to Humboldt; but I will content myself with making one more quotation from the "Social Statics" of that great philosopher, Herbert Spencer:—"As with the physical, so with the ethical. A belief, as yet fitful and partial, is beginning to spread amongst men, that here also

there is an *indissoluble bond between cause and consequence*, an inexorable destiny, 'a law which altereth not.' . . . Yet in the moral, as in the material world, accumulated evidence is gradually generating the conviction that events are not, at bottom, fortuitous; but that they are wrought out in a certain inevitable way by *unchanging forces*."—Page 54. (Italics are mine.)

Herbert Spencer, you are aware, was not a spiritualist, but has Dr. Child anywhere in his book expressed the doctrine of "Necessity" more strongly? Is Herbert Spencer also a "Satanic Messiah?"

I have thus quoted from various authors, Christian and Infidel, of every shade, from the author of New Testament Epistles to the author of the essay on "Nature," to show you that the ideas of Dr. Child are by no means peculiar to him, and that you are not only unjust, but inconsistent in the extreme, to pour out your venom on him for having stated, in a very clumsy, often unphilosophic and short-sighted manner, what so many others have undertaken to prove.

I desire to return to one of your quotations from this "filthy book" of Dr. Child's, in order to correct the impression it made upon you, and, what is more important as showing your character as a controversialist, to point out the fact that you did not quote with perfect accuracy. You hold up the passage to opprobrium. It reads thus in the book:—"Lucy, the courtesan, is led in an avenue of happiness where her inclinations *immediately* direct, with the *deeper* longings of her soul held for a time in check; and her sister Frances, the faithful wife and mother, in another avenue of happiness, where her inclinations lead." The words "*immediately*" and "*deeper*," which are the key to the meaning of the passage, the author puts in italics. In your quotations the italics do not appear. For what reason, sir? Is it not evident that the whole meaning of the passage depends upon the importance which we attach to these two words? If that be not so, is it not at least a fact that Dr. Child showed the importance he attached to them by italicizing them? Have you not, therefore, misrepresented and weakened the meaning of the author to this extent, by omitting to draw special attention to these words by placing them in italics? What kind of honesty do you call this?

But cannot you see that in the passage you have quoted to condemn, Dr. Child has only stated what must be, to all Christians even, a self-evident truth? "Lucy follows where her inclinations *immediately* direct, with the *deeper* longings of her soul held for a time in check;" therefore she is a courtesan! Be kind enough to point out to me where this is wrong. Does Lucy *not* follow where her inclinations lead? Or are the *deeper* longings of her soul *not* held in check? Or is she *not* a courtesan because

she follows her immediate inclinations, and holds the deeper feelings of her soul in check? Pray, come, sir, let us know precisely what it is with which you find fault in this passage?

Now let me point out a few passages which you have not deigned to quote, because, I doubt not, you felt they would not altogether furnish you with enough "filth" to wantonly splutter over all who disagree with you.

"Vice is an enemy to this world's beauty.—Page 5.

The crime mentioned in the passage you said you were ashamed to quote, is thus described:—

"It is a condition of earthly degradation;" and

"An enemy to the good, the true, the beautiful—that are the crowning excellencies of the material world."—Page 19.

"To do good is a part of the work of life—and to our earthly and spiritual consciousness it is the most beautiful part."—Page 25.

"The recognition of evil, its *resistance and condemnation*" (italics mine) among other things, Dr. Child informs us, "are the legitimate offspring of nature."—Page 41.

"Now, reader, do not go away and say that this book recommends murder."

This is what you have to all intents and purposes done, contrary to the express warning of the author.

"Both crime and *punishment* are links in the chain of cause and effect in the courses of nature."—Page 166.

I have again put the words in italics which I wish you to notice. All your nonsense, therefore, about the murderers pleading "not guilty," on the score of being "lawfully engaged," is answered by Dr. Child's book, when it declares "punishment" for crime to be "legitimate," and therefore right. The foregoing is from one of the notices, as are the following:—

"A vicious man is one who surrenders to temptation for the moment, without regard to the pain that comes in the end."—Page 196.

"The nearer we come to God, the purer grows the soul."—Page 197. (What say you of this?)

"If our inner life be true and pure, we have little to fear from the errors of the head. The soul must first *desire* to do good, and the effort to satiate *that desire* will be forthcoming."—Page 207.

These are only a few passages selected at random, and I venture to assert that they express the real aims of the book far more accurately than the passages you have quoted, especially as you have quoted them. I am not referring here at all to your interpretation of them, for that is just about as unjust and one-sided, as uncharitable and misleading, as your ingenuity could make it. No, I am not speaking of this, but I am alluding to the fact which I have already touched upon, viz., that you have not quoted

fairly. In other words, in my humble opinion at least, you have acted dishonestly, either knowingly or otherwise. Lest you may assert that my opinion is groundless, and abuse me for it, here is the proof: You have quoted A. J. Davis as saying, "Yes, in the highest, widest, truest statement, everything is good, is right, is beautiful." You make it appear, therefore, that A. J. Davis gives his unqualified approval to the book, and that he actually endorses all that you have condemned. Now, let me quote A. J. Davis, as you should have done, without doing him an injustice:—"Yes, in the highest, widest, truest statement, everything is *good*, is *right*, is *beautiful*. But this generous statement is for the far-off future, refers to ultimates, anticipates results; and it is not, therefore, practically adapted to the conditions and intermediates of the past and present. Because the finger of wisdom and goodness is visible in everything, and because there is a world of intelligences environing ours, with which our life and destiny are interlinked and inseparable, it does not follow that everything is *as* perfect, *as* good, *as* pure, *as* beautiful, as it can become and will be in the far-off future time, when every germ will have ultimated its properties, and the buds of earth will have bloomed in heaven."

I, therefore, charge you with having quoted A. J. Davis unfairly, and with having made him say what he felt it necessary to define and modify as though he had given no modification and no definition. How far short of "controversial dishonesty" does this conduct come?

Would it not have been fair, also, to have mentioned that the French infidel sheet, the *Western Review*, is not entirely satisfied with Dr. Child's "Paradox?" Why did you not quote this statement:—"Mr. Child recognizes himself, then, that *there is much to change* (italics mine) in these opposing men, institutions, and things?" And does not the same review—*La Revue de L'ouest*—conclude by suggesting an improvement to Dr. Child's title and conviction for his book in these words:—"I propose to him to amend his apothegm, and say, '*All that which is, is good, but in condition of becoming better.*'" It would appear to me that you have been so in the habit of disjoining passages, and of taking a little here and a little there, leaving out these words and putting in those, twisting and turning, and construing as it suited your purpose, from what you call God's inspired Word, that when you descend down to the level of such uninspired books as Dr. Child's, for the time being, the force of habit is so strong that you run away with the idea that the same method of treatment may lawfully be employed, and that you may twist and turn, suppress and add, just as the genius of the hour may direct. Now, although such a method is very convenient for the clergy, applied to the "Word of God," it won't do for literature that is unin-

spired. With uninspired literature a man requires to be honest. When he professes to give the real meaning of the author, he must quote those portions fairly that support that meaning, and not suppress those passages which the author specially relied upon to define his position exactly. The texts in the Bible are like a set of chessmen—you move them about according to the game you are playing. Not so profane literature, which was never intended to furnish toys for the priests; it plays only one game—the game of the author—and whosoever interferes with this is an interloper and an obstructionist, deserving truly to be put under the restraint of a moral *clôture*.

On the 4th page of your letter you thus moralize on your own interpretation of my conduct:—"But how much more serious is it when a man stands deliberately before his fellow-men, as you do, openly avowing himself to be an Apostle of Falsehood?" How must I moralize on *your* conduct when I have such abundant proofs of your perversions, misrepresentations, and what cannot be otherwise than characterized as untruths? If falsehood requires an apostle, permit me, rev. sir, to assure you that I never met anyone more qualified to do honour to the position than yourself.

I am very much obliged for your solicitations for my eternal welfare, but unless you are able to adduce something like argument in support of your views, you cannot expect to win me over.

Your sermon at the end of your letter might have been spared, for you beg the entire question at issue—"Tis Jesus who has raised nations from the depths of heathen ignorance and degradation" is just the very thing I have asked you to prove, and which you appear so afraid to attempt. "Tis Jesus who is ever in the van of all true progress" is what I wanted you to affirm in debate, but which you prefer to assert in the midst of a torrent of commonplace rhapsody. Such a long string of religious (?) phrases are impervious to the influence of common sense, and I shall not waste more of my time by noticing them. Should you feel inclined to give me some proof for what you say, I shall then be at your service. In the meantime, let me ask you again, "Are you willing to discuss the relative merits of Orthodoxy and Infidelity?"

The following expressions I desire to thank you for:—

1st.—"Allow me to express my sincere regret that I find your soul in the bondage of such demoniacal fetters."

2nd.—"I do earnestly pray that you may see your sin."

3rd.—"I do most earnestly and affectionately entreat you to flee from this worse than Sodom and Gomorrah."

4th.—"Will you not be warned in time?"

5th.—"I speak plainly, but, as God knoweth, I do not speak unkindly." (Very necessary information.)

6th.—“I wish, if it be possible, to open your eyes, so that you may see your danger; and, if you persist, I warn you of your doom.”

These expressions comport but ill with the rest of your letter, and especially with those paragraphs I quoted at the beginning of this letter. Nevertheless, I will give you the credit of being sincere. I only wish to assure you that silly, emotional platitudes do not affect me, and it is folly for you to waste your time in trying to influence me by that means. I am open to reason and to facts, and, when you have these to offer in support of your cause, you will find me an earnest listener. In the meantime, be less abusive and more argumentative.

When you are ready to defend your cause in public, I am ready to meet you.—I remain, yours truly,

THOS. WALKER.

Rev. J. A. Dowie.

6 CAROLINA-TERRACE, Drummond-street,
Carlton, 13th March, 1882.

REV. SIR,—I am awaiting a reply to my last letter to you. Should none be received before the termination of this week, it is my intention to have our correspondence published, just as it has been forwarded and received.—I remain, yours truly,

THOS. WALKER.

Rev. J. A. Dowie.

VICTORIA COFFEE PALACE, Collins-street,
Melbourne, 16th March, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—Yours dated 13th received, saying that you are awaiting reply to yours dated 20th February, and that it is your intention to have our correspondence published.

As to my reply, I must plainly say that I did not, and do not, think that your letter was worth the trouble of a reply, so far as you personally are concerned: for its contents prove that you are not an honest seeker after truth in any degree.

But as you declare your intention of publishing the correspondence (although you have no right to do so without my consent), I will, for the sake of others, reply to your letter as soon as convenient—which will not be until Monday or Tuesday next, at soonest.

There are three stipulations, however, which I will make before consenting to the publication of these letters—(1) that Mr. S——’s letters to me of 6th and 7th February shall be included; (2) that Mr. S——’s name shall not be used without his consent; and (3) that I shall see and approve the proof-sheets, ere they go finally to press.

I trust you will see that these conditions are only fair and reasonable. I do not wish to alter anything I have written, but I want to see that what I wrote and received is correctly printed.—I am, faithfully yours,

JOHN ALEX. DOWIE.

Mr. Thomas Walker, 6 Carolina-terrace,
Drummond-street, Carlton.

VICTORIA COFFEE PALACE, Collins-street,
Melbourne, 18th March, 1882.

DEAR SIR,—Amongst the ancient Greeks there was a saying that “against stupidity even the gods are powerless.” I am filled with a sense of its truth, as regards *men* at all events, when I look at your letter of fifty-six pages, dated 20th February, now lying before. It is a continent of infidel mud, in which even an intellectual giant might be overwhelmed, unless very cautious. It is not only stupid, in its utter failure to recognize the principles of truth and reason, but it is full of a certain kind of clever and cunning sophistry, in its attempts to cover its slimy depths with a carpet of false reasoning, based upon false assertions as to facts.

I confess, therefore, that I would approach the unpleasant task of examining and replying to it with great reluctance, except for the opportunity it gives me of stripping your philosophy of its false garments, and exposing it in its real character, as being “earthly, sensual, and devilish.” May the Eternal Spirit of God open your eyes to see, and your ears to hear, and your heart to receive, light and truth.

I will first address a few observations to you concerning some of your personal charges against me, which I shall subsequently show to be as unjust as they are numerous. I do not complain of such charges from men in your condition of soul—indeed, I fully expect them: for you are only thereby proving yourselves to be faithful servants of a vile master. Some years ago, in Sydney, numerous threats of personal violence, and even death, reached me from spiritualists, and from “spirits” even, who attended certain *séances* in that city.

One of these latter “spirits” was wrought up into a fearful state of wrath with me, because of certain lectures I was at the time delivering against the doctrines of these “devils,” and in a poem which he inspired, and which was officially communicated to me, this “spirit,” calling himself “Philosopheme,” addressed me thus in the closing verse:—

“One word—then for battle we hold in our breath
To fight you! By God! we shall fight to the death;
Through earth, heaven, hell, and the range of endeavour,
We fight you; by God! we will fight you forever!”

The letter accompanying this effusion was addressed "To that infamous antichrist, the most reverend John Alex. Dowie;" and I was informed therein that "elevated" spiritualists well knew that I was a most infamous being—no other than "a seducing embodied spirit, and under the inspiration of a lying disembodied spirit of the worst kind, which is likely to continue with you in this life, until you arrive at that purgatory below the earth sphere, which will surely attend you in the next life," &c.

I was further charged with being "assiduous in the dissemination of falsehood, in the mendacity of speech, and in superlative paralogism and malversation against the truth," &c., &c. But it was a woeful mistake upon the part of the "spirits," and their mortal circle, to choose such a scribe: for, happening to show the letter to a commercial friend in Sydney, he immediately recognized the writing as that of a great rogue, who had only been a few months out of Darlinghurst Gaol, where he had spent a number of years for forgery and embezzlement. This fact, told publicly the next Sunday by me, without mentioning the poor creature's name, and an indication that I might be compelled also to disclose some of the doings of the professional medium concerned in the production of this poem and letter, caused the immediate collapse of "the circle," and the speedy disappearance of the scribe and medium, who troubled me with no more communications from the "spirits." Another of your friends wrote to me—"You will burn in hell—your soul, I mean—for you are the biggest and most wicked liar in Sydney, and the lowest depth of hell is your portion; and you will be damned in hell."

This letter was "dedicated to A. J. Dowie, Sydney, who has sold himself to the devil for gain." In addition, I received many letters at various times threatening my life, one of which declared that if I wrote again on the subject, "a piece of lead will be put through your b——y heart;" and the others were of a similar nature—some even threatening my wife and children's lives. Of course, I need scarcely say that none of these things moved me: for I have not so learned of Christ as to fear any or all of these hellish foes, whether in or out of the flesh, since my life is in His keeping. I tell you, therefore, these facts only that you may know, for the future, that I am perfectly indifferent to all your vile language, and all the concoctions of the filthy spirits who attend your *séances* in this city: for I know whose you all are, and whom you all serve, and, so long as you are in that service, I expect just such treatment as you have given me in your letter.

I am grateful to you for linking me with my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ in the opening sentences of your letter. Your blasphemy against Him for denouncing the hypocrisy and uncleanness of His day is only to be expected, when it is remembered that He "cast out devils," and put your master

himself and all his hellish host to flight. The hypocritical Pharisees, and the venomous materialistic Sadducees, of that day, as of this, got on very well with the demons who were working such woe in those times, as in this. You and yours would doubtless have helped these fiends to crucify Him, as you help them now to crucify Him afresh and put Him to an open shame, so far as words can do it. But you honour me too highly when you say, "In this respect you have imitated your Master well, if you have not even surpassed Him." No mortal tongue can ever express the love for sinners, and the hatred for their sins, which fell in words of eternal power from Jesus' lips. Would that I could—alas! that I am still so far off—reach nearer to Him in both aspects of His character. Still I will follow Him: for I ever seem to hear Him say—

"Wherever wrong shall right deny,
Or suffering spirits urge their plea,
Be thou a voice to smite the lie,
A hand to set the captive free."

Hence I do what I can to smite this awful lie called Spiritualism, or rather multitude of lies: for, when I ask you "What is thy name?" as Jesus did of that "man with an unclean spirit" long ago (see Mark v. 1-20), your reply is, like his, "My name is Legion: for we are many." May it also be that you, like him, may be soon dispossessed, and "clothed, and in your right mind;" may you tell your friends "how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and how He had mercy on thee." Yes, your name is Legion: for you are many, and your devices are many. You are all things to all men, if by any means you can destroy some with your master's many wiles, ancient and modern.

You take exception to my assertion that "my beliefs are not in question;" and you say, "I called your beliefs in question." But my statement is the exact truth. The question upon which alone you were called in by Mr. S—to help him concerning was "Spiritualism:" for that was the only question discussed between him and I. That question you have cunningly and persistently evaded. Your calling of my beliefs in question does not matter a jot. I met a drunken man who called them in question the other day, and whilst he was doing so he stammered, staggered, and fell into the gutter. Do you think that I discussed questions of religion and morality with him? No, indeed.

I would gladly do so, when he was sober enough to listen to reason and truth—when the accursed spirit, "Alcohol," had gone out of him. And so I will with you. But, whilst you hug this vile concoction of all forms of falsehood, called "Spiritualism," to your breast, as a drunkard does a rum-flask, and whilst you drink

of its maddening, spiritually intoxicating cup, I will not discuss with you, or anyone else in your position, the sublime beauty of the Lord Jesus and His teaching. "Spiritualism," and that alone, is the question which originated this correspondence; but for reasons of your own, which you dare not avow, you shun it. As to whether I "dare" to defend my views, when a proper occasion arises, there can be no question whatever, seeing that I have been doing that for more than fourteen years, and my bitterest foes have never charged me with cowardice.

As to your question under which heading (Faith, Hope, or Charity) a number of severe, but needful, comments upon your character as a controversialist are to be classed, I reply, under that of Charity; for God, who knows all hearts, knows that I wrote only what I believed to be true, in a spirit of love towards your soul; and, no matter what you or others may say or think, I know that I am writing in that same spirit in this letter—and He who alone is my judge knows that also.

You say that I am guilty of misrepresenting you by saying, "You ask me to fight upon two distinct platforms at the same moment." But I think your challenge in Mr. S——'s letter of 6th February, and in yours of 8th and 11th, can leave no other impression upon candid minds than that you wanted *one discussion*, in which the issues would be confused, and not *two distinct discussions*—you never use the plural number—as would be required, if Christianity and Infidelity were to be separately discussed upon their respective merits. That is my impression still, and the whole tenor of your last letter, in which you confuse everything, confirms me in still asserting that to have been your true object in your proposals. Indeed, your closing question in that letter proves it: for you therein say:—"Are you willing to discuss the relative merits of Orthodoxy *and* Infidelity?" You nowhere speak of two distinct discussions. I stated my willingness, under certain conditions, to enter upon one discussion—namely, that on Spiritualism; but you have always been determined to mix up Christianity with it, to which I wholly demur.

You ask me to point out the place where you demand that I shall discuss with you on "Infidelity, Materialism, Rationalism, Atheism, Deism, and a host of anonymous foes of God and man, whom you vaguely hint at as '&c., &c.'"

This is certainly a most audacious question, in the face of your words in your letter of 8th February, where you say that you cling to your proposal to discuss "Infidelity" with me, adding, "Infidelity not only covers Spiritualism, but Rationalism, Materialism, Atheism, Deism, &c., &c.; surely you, as a clergyman, must be convinced that none of these are conducive to morality and progress." How dare you, in the face of these words, say to me, "Point me out, sir, the very place, and quote

the very passage, or I shall be obliged to accuse you of daring misrepresentation?" Well, now you have the very passage, and what do you think of yourself? I leave all honest men to judge. Your quibbling about not *identifying* yourself with all these systems, which you undertook to affirm "are conducive to morality and progress," is too transparent a trick to succeed with people of good sense. You were completely confounded with, and could not answer, my arguments as to your utterly reckless and inconsistent conduct, which I likened to that of a "mercenary soldier," &c., and I now repeat the charge, which I have again fairly proved. More, I add to it this: Your Spiritualism is like a cruel Pirate, who really sails under the Black Flag of death and hell upon the sea of human life, but who keeps a stock of false colours, which he cunningly flies when necessary, to delude the foolish and get near enough to destroy, if possible, the feeble and unwary among men; and then, when sure of his prey, he orders servants like you to haul down the deceptive flag and display his true colours—the grinning death's head and bare white bones of Infidelity upon its black ground of Despair. Yes, Spiritualism sometimes sails the summer seas, and appears to spread snowy wings like an angel from heaven, whilst it unfurls to the breeze the white flag of the Cross of Christ, and pretends to be a vessel bound for the Christian's Home above. Many have been deceived thereby, and have gone on board this Pirate ship of Hell, not knowing its true character until too late; and many, alas! have been further deceived into joining its demoniac crew—many who have at last made awful "shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience," amidst the mocking laughter of the "seducing spirits" who had ensnared them into Satan's service.

Yes, Spiritualism has its Rationalistic flag for the proud, self-sufficient, intellectual egotist, whose god is his shallow brains, whose religion is what he is pleased to call "Science," and who reckons upon building somehow a tower to reach to heaven, so as to get there without any help, and be able to tell God he can do without Him. And so the Rationalist gets on board, and Spiritualism lands him, very appropriately, at some modern Tower of Babel, where he spends his wretched days in striving to interpret the irreconcilable jargon of the fiends, who mock him with all kinds of confused language and thought, until he perishes there.

And so with the Materialist, the Atheist, and the Deist. You were quite right in saying that the Spiritualism which you teach "covers them all:" for it carries the flags of all. My reading of its literature, now extending over four years, justifies me in saying that every form of Paganism as well as Infidelity—every form of evil, in short—is covered by Spiritualism. It is the Jesuitism of Atheism especially, and one of the most dangerous forms of

that old Serpent, the Devil, with which this earth has been cursed.

You have utterly failed in your pitiful endeavour to wriggle out of my having proved you to be most inconsistent, in having to admit "that the Infidelity you were prepared to defend covers systems of belief and morals incongruous with each other," and yet that you still declared, "I am prepared to show that they are all of them more conducive to morality and progress than Christianity." It is a laughable farce to see how you labour to disentangle yourself, by endeavouring to show how I would have been entangled, according to your account, had I ventured to discuss the merits of orthodox Christianity with you. Your imagination, or the misguided inspiration of some mischievous spirit which was befooling you, led you to say that the Orthodoxy which I would have defended, would have included the most absurd and irreconcilable systems of pseudo-Christianity. Why, if I did so, I would be as great a mercenary, as a Christian, as you are as an Infidel or Spiritualist. You say:—"The Lutherans believe in the 'real presence,' as do the Roman Catholics. The Anglicans and others do not. On this point there is incongruity. Yet, in defending Orthodoxy, you must defend both that of the Lutheran and that of the Anglican." Now, apart from the question of fact as to what are the Lutheran and Anglican doctrines concerning the "real presence," I just ask—Did any rational being ever make a more irrational statement than that which I have just quoted? Why, of course, I would only defend what I believed the Scriptures to teach on that or any question of Christian belief; and it would be as easy to get me to defend the dogma of papal infallibility, or any other screaming absurdity, as the doctrine of transubstantiation in any form. If I could defend all these opposed doctrines, I could sign all kinds of contradictory creeds, make all kinds of contradictory vows, and preach—if they were insane enough to allow me—in a Roman Catholic church in the morning, a Presbyterian church in the afternoon, and in a Lutheran, Wesleyan, or any other, church at night. Do you really think all men are fools in every sense, as to suppose such conduct would be tolerated by any number of men who were not idiots, or, perhaps, spiritualists? If I acted in such a manner I should stand in immediate need of quarters at Yarra Bend Lunatic Asylum. But, permit me to assist you in your "inspired" argument. You have only to add to your list of orthodox persons, whom I would have to defend, those who call themselves Christian Spiritualists, and then you would have me completely—for, in defending their doctrine of Spiritualism, do you not see that I would walk straight into my enemy's castle, and have to surrender at discretion! The argument is utterly illogical, and beneath contempt, and is scarcely worth the application of this *reductio ad absurdum*.

You refer to my statement that you were willing to prove Spiritualism, Materialism, Atheism, Rationalism, Deism, &c., to be "*equally* conducive to morality and progress;" and, getting into another theatrical rage, you say—"I insist, sir, point me out the very paragraph, the very words, or forever know that you have told a lie," &c. This, again, is only another cuttle-fish kind of trick, an attempt to escape from your own words in the passage which I have already quoted, where you say, that the Infidelity which you are prepared to prove is conducive to morality and progress "covers them all;" and, therefore, that they are all equally good is to be fairly inferred, and equally conducive to morality and progress.

If I were to say Christianity covers truth, faith, hope, wisdom, and love, and is conducive to morality and progress, it would be fair for you to say that I held all these graces to be *equally* conducive to morality and progress, although I hold *the greatest* of these to be *love*; and it was just in that sense that I employed the word "*equally*." Perhaps, however, you may wish to distinguish Atheism as *the greatest* amongst your moral and progressive agencies; and, if you do wish to make it pre-eminent in your teaching, you may, and still remain a Spiritualist, according to some "spirit" authorities.

You will therein agree, for instance, with a "French-Normandy spirit," claiming to have been in "the higher existence" no less than "three hundred years," which, by permission of what spiritualists consider a distinguished circle, advocated the following theoretical dogmas:—(1.) *THERE IS NO GOD*; nothing in the universe of being but matter, and the negative forces in matter. (2.) *ANNIHILATION IS TRUE*; or a conscious future existence, in the sense of endlessness, is a farce. Spiritual beings, by becoming more pure and etherealized, are finally absorbed in the great ocean of refined matter, snuffed out, losing their consciousness and their identity. (3.) *FATALISM IS A TRUTH*. Man is not responsible for an act of his life. All things, including men and their actions, are fated, or necessitated to be precisely as they are. *Man is a thing.*"

This Satan-inspired utterance of "a seducing spirit" is to be found in the work of Dr. J. M. Peebles, entitled, "Around the World," at page 204. Do you wish to elevate the teaching of this "spirit" to the chief place in your system? If you will say so, I will so far modify my statement as to say, that, whilst you certainly hold all these incongruous systems to be equally conducive to morality and progress, yet in the advance guard of these "doctrines of devils" you place Atheism, Annihilation, and Fatalism. Will that suit you? It is, at least, all I can do.

Your sixth complaint is that I have done you a wrong by saying that you have "confessed that you are a Spiritualist,

Rationalist, Materialist, Atheist, Deist, &c., all rolled into one under the the name of Infidel." And then you again proceed, with absurd bravado, to dare me to quote your "words to express such a confession."

I am almost weary of doing such things; but I will once more respond to your appeal for information concerning yourself.

In the first sentence of your letter of 11th February, you say:—"I am spreading Infidelity." Surely, then, you admit *there* that you are an Infidel. In your letter of 8th February, you say:—"Infidelity not only covers Spiritualism, but Rationalism, Materialism, Atheism, Deism, &c., &c." Surely, then, you admit *there* that you embody all these systems in your own person, as you are spreading them all, according to your own *confession* of 11th February; and you are, therefore, what I say you are, "all rolled into one, under the name of Infidel." Can anything be clearer? All your attempts to wriggle out of the fetters of your own *confession* are unavailing. It suits your purpose *now* to say something different, when you see how your own voluntary, written words condemn you. But it is too late. You have shared, in this matter, the usual fate of the wicked—"Behold, he travaileth with iniquity, and hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood; he made a pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made" (Psalm vii. 15).

And there I leave you. If you will confess and forsake your sin, God will be merciful, and bring you out of that "horrible pit and miry clay" into which you have dragged so many. But remember that, till then, no man can help you; and concerning you the word of God is:—"His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealing shall come down upon his own pate." You have reviled and blasphemed the Son of God, whose mercy alone spares your wicked life, which is spent in such sinful antagonism to His purposes and will; you have deliberately charged the greatest of the Apostles, Paul, with being a liar; and you are constantly striving to destroy and discredit, by false charges, the authority of the Most High God in every way you can. Of course, all your puny endeavours are as vain and ineffectual to affect or injure Him, as if they were never put forth; but, remember, that, if His judgments tarry, yet they are sure, and terrible to the impenitent.

Your slander against Paul, based upon Romans iii. 7, is a most iniquitous perversion of the passage; for, if the 8th verse is read with it, seeing it is part of the same sentence, it is at once seen that he is speaking concerning false charges made against him, things "slandrously reported, and as some affirm that we say." He no more imagines that if he told a lie it would abound to the glory of God, than he believes it would be right to say, "Let us do evil that good may come." He says, concerning those who practise such iniquity, "whose condemnation is just," and that condem-

nation rests upon you : for here you are caught in the very act of slanderously reporting what you must know to be false. But I do not wonder at your hatred of that unselfish, noble-hearted preacher and teacher, Paul, whose life was one of the grandest and most fruitful for good of any lived on earth. He saw, and routed, the demon hosts who now inspire your hatred, and uttered that divinely-inspired word to the soldiers of Christ in every age—"Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." He never mistook the real enemy with whom he had to fight. "For," said he, "our wrestling is not with flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Ephesians vi. 11-12). And you hate him for that reason.

But I honour him, and only wish I were more like him. Contrary to your presumptuous warning not to follow Paul too closely, I would that I could follow him as closely as he followed Christ ; then I should be more powerful in wrestling with these "spiritual hosts of wickedness," to whom it is your desire to hand over every soul on earth.

Your approval of Voltaire, Paine, Bradlaugh, &c., as liberators of mankind, and openers of "the thousand doors of truth," will, I hope, open the eyes of any amongst your followers who have respect for private virtue, or public law. The scenes of the Reign of Terror in France not a century ago, when Infidelity established its worship of the Goddess of Reason, in the form of a shameless woman of the streets, and ruled by the guillotine, until the land was deluged in blood, by fiends like Robespierre and Marat—these are triumphs of Paine, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and all that horrid infidel crew who then manned the Slave Ship of Hell, when it bore the name of "The Age of Reason."

The utterly sensual and soulless creed of Bradlaugh would, if supreme, restore those days for which your soul seems to pine. Let your companions and victims note the fact.

Your seventh complaint is, that I charge you with teaching "mental, moral, social, and spiritual chaos and anarchy." Well, if your letters do not prove the charge, what do they prove? I will leave the answer to those who may read this correspondence, in full confidence as to what the answer will be, if they are honest and unprejudiced. There is not even a semblance of order in your thoughts. They seem to me like a dense Indian jungle abounding with poison plants, venomous vipers, ravenous beasts, and slimy reptiles of every kind ; whilst a horrible miasma rises from its fetid marshes, laden with fevers, pestilence, and death.

And now I come to that portion of the jungle where you

profess to review and reply to my criticism of Dr. A. B. Child's book, "Whatever is, is Right." It is an almost inaccessible labyrinth of pestiferous writing, neither honest nor clever, as I shall show; but simply productive of a mass of briars and thorns, and noxious weeds. It is scarcely worth the task of cutting down, except for the opportunity it gives to me of killing some of the adders and asps which find shelter there.

You try, chameleon-like, to change Dr. Child's colour, and disarm what I have written, by saying at the outset, "Not one of the passages which you have quoted from his work are *peculiarly spiritualistic*." Now, how dare you affirm that, when the whole work is "spiritualistic" from beginning to end? It was originally published in the *Banner of Light*, the principal spiritualistic organ in the United States, and it bears the endorsement of the spiritualistic press generally, and of leading spiritualists. The author himself tells us, in his preface, that the thoughts expressed in it were gathered from many sources, amongst which are "from talking with devils and talking with angels." Besides which, two of the most damaging extracts which I quoted from his book are found at pages 102-3, which form part of a distinct chapter headed "Spiritualism." And before I go further, I will add to my quotations from that chapter two more, just to show you how "peculiarly spiritualistic" the book is. At page 102, Dr. Child says:—"The clean outside and the virtuous life are to Spiritualism just the same as the habiliments of crime, pollution, and degradation." Again, at page 103:—"Distinctions among men, to Spiritualism, are phantoms."

In a chapter on "Human Distinctions," at page 118, he makes the doctrine yet clearer, and says:—"This great distinction between good and bad men is a *moral and religious fiction*, found nowhere except in the vapour of man's belief, in his materialism, in man's judgment."

Or, to refer again to the preface, he says:—"It (this book) has approbation for everything, and condemnation for nothing. It recognizes no merit, no demerit, in human souls." Oh, yes, it is Spiritualism which is "peculiarly" responsible for these "doctrines of devils," which teach, as he does, in the preface:—"The soul produces deeds called good and bad . . . and by these products of the soul it can in no way be influenced, retarded, or advanced in its eternal progression." So, then, do good or do evil, it matters not a jot to the advanced spiritualist; he asserts that nothing he may do can in any way retard his soul's progress, and, therefore, no law, human or divine, can restrain, guide, or affect him!

Permit me, then, to fling aside your preliminary quibble, and to present you with the interesting fact that the whole book is "peculiarly spiritualistic," beyond a doubt.

Now, what have I to do in this argument with all the rubbish which you have strung together about Pope, whom Christians do *not* "claim as belonging to them;" about Calvin, whom you do not quote, and entirely misrepresent; about Buckle, whose peculiar doctrines I am not responsible for, nor have undertaken to discuss; about John Stuart Mill, who was not a Christian in any sense, and from whom you quote nothing; or about Max Müller, Stuart Glennie, Herbert Spencer, or any other of the writers from whom you so irrelevantly quote at such length? Simply nothing.

None of these, even if they all wrongly approved Dr. Child's doctrine, which they do not, could make it right, if it were wrong.

But your trick is too transparent. You simply want to put me off the scent, and get me, if possible, to hunt some other game than your poor, exhausted, spiritualistic Child.

You know well that none of these writers have ever dared to pen such atrocious sentiments as his, and that, even if they did, it would in no way affect my argument. No; this doctrine is "peculiarly spiritualistic," and rationalistic, atheistic, materialistic, or deistic allies cannot help you in defending it, as you wish them to do. I am dealing with Spiritualism in your person, and with that alone; and, therefore, the gate of the arena is closed, meanwhile, to all other combatants, until this business is finished. "No admittance," therefore, is my answer to your crowd of discordant allies.

But you have dared to say that I must not attack your "spiritualistic" Child, because the Apostle Paul taught the doctrine of "whatever is, is right." You know that assertion to be wholly false: for there is not a single passage in all his writings which will bear such an interpretation.

You refer to—though you, very cunningly, did not exactly quote—his words in Romans ix. 21:—"Or hath not the potter a right over the clay, from the same lump to make one part a vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?"

But continue the quotation to the next verse, and note how applicable it is to you—"What if God, willing to show His wrath, and to make His power known, endured with much longsuffering vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction?" You, like the wicked Jews to whom the words were first applied, have rejected the Saviour and the counsel of God, and have become "a vessel of wrath," which Satan fills, at your own desire, "full of abominations;" and you, thereby, make "drunken with the wine of (spiritual) fornication" the misguided persons who drink, at your hands, from that "cup of devils" called Spiritualism. I say to you, as Paul said to the Corinthians, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils." You have chosen the latter of your own deliberate free will, and are daily insulting the Most

High. You are "fitted unto destruction," yet the Lord displays His anger, power, and longsuffering in permitting you to live. Were He a man, like yourself, He would crush you at once. But, because He is God, He spares you, partly as a righteous punishment upon this people for their great national sins; partly to show, by contrast with your vile, mean, and weak blasphemies, the glory and power of His Eternal Son and His Gospel; and, partly, to give you time for repentance, so showing His mercy and love to the most wretched sinners. But, beware, lest your day of grace be gone, and His open judgments overtake you.

You have also tried to shield Dr. Child by striving to defile the Word of God, and have dared to say—"Every crime, sir, which disgraces humanity I can point out to you as commanded and sanctioned by the God of the Old Testament," &c. This is but repeating, parrot-like, the infamous slanders and blasphemies of Voltaire, Paine, Ingersoll, and others, which have been refuted again and again. It is a profitless task to answer such as you, who, as I have now so often proved, cannot really honestly believe in your own assertions. But, for the sake of others, I will briefly show how absolutely false your statements are concerning what the Bible teaches.

Your first quotation is from the 38th chapter of Genesis, and it shows that so far from God having "commanded and sanctioned" the horrible sins therein recorded, that He visited them with immediate and condign punishment, and left the record for the warning of every age—a warning needed by such as you, who approve of Bradlaugh, whose horrid teaching commends similar abominations, and for doing which certain of his obscene works have been suppressed by law. This charge, therefore, is found false, and returns upon your own head.

Your next, "the daughters of Lot," is also a wicked libel: for you know that their detestable sin was never sanctioned by God, but the contrary, and was the result, also, of that demoniac sin of intemperance which Spiritualism does so much to foster in every sense—for, like Lot's daughters, "your vine is the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah." God's curse rested upon the offspring of that sin, the Moabites and Ammonites, who clung to their mothers' vices; and many of the terrible judgments of God upon these wicked nations, who were ever the foes of God's people in after ages, can only be understood by the light of that awful story in Genesis. For some such purpose it was recorded. This charge, also, "comes down upon your own pate."

Your next is the sins of Solomon. Well, how dare you charge God with these? Read the 11th chapter of I. Kings, and you will see that all these wicked deeds were evil in the sight of the Lord; and again, in the 9th verse, "The Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel;" and,

in the 11th and two following verses, God's judgment against him is decreed :—"Forasmuch as this is done of thee . . . I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and give it to thy servant ;" and, finally, because of these sins, the prophet Ahijah is sent to Jeroboam to tell him of God's purpose to make him king over the ten tribes of Israel, and Solomon's reign and life close in a night of terror, rebellion, and impending doom—a fearful end to what, but for these sins, would have been a glorious career. Again your charge against God is proved false.

Your next libel is concerning "the adultery of David." How dare you say God "sanctioned, commanded," or in any degree tolerated, or approved that horrid crime, with its accompaniment of murder? The story of these sins, as recorded in II. Samuel, 11th chapter, ends with these words :—"But the thing which David had done displeased the Lord." The following chapter, in which the prophet Nathan's message from God is recorded, shows with what detestation He viewed, and with what severity He punished David for these very sins ; on account of which He said (10th verse) :—"The sword shall never depart from thine house, because thou hast despised Me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah, the Hittite, to be thy wife." Alas for David ! his sin could not rest with himself ; it was the ruin of his family, the disintegrator of his kingdom, a curse to the Jewish race, and, as Nathan said, "By this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme." As one of the Lord's enemies, although the deed happened nearly three thousand years ago, you rake it up for the purpose of blaspheming—thus confirming Nathan's prophecy. But your charge again recoils upon yourself, and God is shown to be righteous and holy, hating sin, and punishing those who commit it ; yet mercifully forgiving, as in David's case, the truly penitent.

Your next charge is based upon Numbers xxxi., 17th and 18th verses. But those words were not spoken by the Lord. They form part of what Moses said, beginning with the 15th verse. It is only a portion of a dark and mysterious page of human history, the destruction of the horribly wicked Midianites and Canaanites, who filled the Promised Land with the foulest idolatries and vices which had ever cursed the earth. I do not pretend to solve all mysteries, as spiritualists do. These events occurred more than thirty-three centuries ago, in a condition of human life, and under a dispensation of Divine government, entirely different to that under which we live. Such deeds would be wicked and wrong in our days, and we have far mightier weapons against our foes than weapons of human warfare. Possibly, this was one of the instances where Moses did not rightly interpret the commands of God. The Lord Jesus, with whom alone I have to do, said (Mathew xix. 8, and Mark

x. 5), regarding the Mosaic law of divorce, for instance, these words:—"Moses, for your hardness of heart, suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it hath not been so;" and then He goes on to lay down the true law of divorce—a law which you spiritualists hate and denounce. In the same way then, perhaps, "for the hardness of their hearts," Moses was *permitted* to give such commands as in the passage you quote from Numbers; but it does not follow God *approved* such deeds.

For instance, God *permits* such vile systems as Spiritualism, Mormonism, and Mohammedanism to exist; but He most certainly does not approve them.

He commands His Church to destroy them; and, as in the case of the Mohammedan power in Turkey, He *permitted* the horrible late Russo-Turkish war to work for the destruction of the power of the false prophet; but He never "commanded" nor "sanctioned" the barbarities of that war, nor of any war. For as Paul says, in 2 Corinthians x. 4, 5:—"The weapons of our warfare are not of the flesh, but mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds, casting down imaginations, and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." So again your charge against God fails.

Your last blasphemy against God, as sanctioning and commanding sin, is based upon Jeremiah iii. 9, where, so far from doing that, any candid reader will see that God, by the mouth of His prophet, is reproving the people of Israel for their sins, under the appropriate figure of an adulterous wife, and especially for idolatry. "Hast thou seen what backsliding Israel hath done?" is the question of the Lord, to which the passage you quote is a part of the answer, in which "her treacherous sister, Judah," is also condemned.

And yet you dare to quote this as an instance of God's having "sanctioned and commanded every crime which has disgraced humanity." Again you have fallen into the ditch which you made for me; and this, the last of your blasphemous misrepresentations of the Bible, falls upon your own miserable head, as did the rest.

And what shall I say to you, in the name of the Lord, ere I turn from the exposure of this portion of your reckless malignity? I will address you in the words which Paul employed (Acts xiii. 10) to a man of your stamp, named "Elymas, the sorcerer," at the island of Cyprus long ago: "O, full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" It is not my province to go further, and say, as Paul did, "Thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season;" but I can say

confidently, "And now, behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee," and I warn you to turn from your evil ways: for "he that, being often reprov'd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy." I have seen this warning terribly fulfilled within the last few years, in several striking instances, in these colonies, in the persons of daring blasphemers like yourself.

And now, I pursue my examination of your letter, at that point of "the jungle" where you resume your defence of Dr. Child's "specially spiritualistic" work, "Whatever is, is Right." You expend a great deal of strength, and no less than three pages of your letter, in bringing forth a most serious charge of misquotation against me, founded upon—what? Why, a mere omission to underline two words which Dr. Child had placed in italics. The very mention of this charge is its condemnation; because all will admit, that the accidental omission of the italics is of no material consequence, since the sentiment is quite as detestable with them.

You evidently approve the principle of "prostitution," as Dr. Child unquestionably does. You say:—"Lucy follows where her inclinations *immediately* direct, with the *deeper* longings of her soul held for a time in check; therefore she is a courtesan! Be kind enough to point out to me where this is wrong." Really, your blindness is startling. Well, I will try to show you.

But I must first require you to omit the word "follows" after the word "Lucy," in your quotation, and to add there the important words which you have left out—namely, "the courtesan, is led in an avenue of happiness"—a much more important omission than my italics. You see, the point lies there, since, according to Dr. Child, Lucy is as much "led" [Do the spirits lead her?] in an "avenue of happiness," as is her sister Frances, "the faithful wife and mother;" and they are both to be regarded as in "avenues" which lead straight to heaven—for he says, on page 35, that "there is no way in which the soul goes forth in life that does not lead directly to heaven." And yet, you ask me to point out where this is wrong? Well, just put your question in this form:—"James, the murderer; George, the burglar; and Alfred, the adulterer, are led in avenues of happiness where their inclinations *immediately* direct, with the *deeper* longings of their souls held for a time in check; therefore, one is a murderer, the other a thief, and the third an adulterer! Be kind enough to point out to me where this is wrong." Well, if you were to put the question that way, I would refer you to the police, just as, in answering the question in the other form, I would refer you, if you are a married man, to your wife for an answer. But, whilst I am on this phase of the question, permit me to refer to another proof of Dr. Child's approval of this vice. At page 135, he says:—"The woman of shame and suffering that met Christ at Jacob's

well was just as near God before she preached Christ as after." Comment is needless.

You point me out a number of passages, some of them only parts of sentences, which you reproach me for not having "deigned to quote." But, if any reader of this correspondence has access to this book, and will test your quotations, he will find them garbled and incorrect in every instance.

Take, for example, that from page 19, where you say that Dr. Child writes concerning prostitution:—"It is a condition of earthly degradation;" and there you stop, without completing the sentence, which continues, "produced by the distinctions of the material world, not by soul comparisons." This is a daring piece of imposition; for further on, as I quoted, he declares these "distinctions" to be "*the fictitious distinctions of self-excellence.*"

Again, your quotation from page 41 does not even begin with a sentence, nor end one, but is a mere distorted clip from the middle of one, which is written regarding things which are said to be "the legitimate offspring of Nature." It begins with "groans and sighs," and then takes in your clip, going on to include, among other legitimate things, "ten thousand beliefs and anti-beliefs that agitate the religious and moral world," &c. This is another case of garbling.

Again, you quote from page 71:—"Now, reader, do not go away and say that this book recommends murder;" and you say this is what I have, "to all intents and purposes, done." You are right—I did so, and I do it again: for not only do the passages which I quoted prove the charge, but it is substantiated by many other portions of the book, notably at pages 63 to 65, in a chapter headed "The cause of what we call Evil."

Referring to this very crime of murder, he says, at page 64:—"And the man we call a free moral agent, kills another man that we call a free moral agent. This deed we call evil. What is the cause? Nature. What is Nature? God. And is Nature wrong? Is God, the great main-spring of Nature, wicked? . . . The desires of men, and the inclinations of men—from whence come they? From God, direct and immediate." Now, what is this but a direct approval of murder, and justification of the murderer?

It is the identical defence which that cowardly and fiendish assassin of President Garfield—Guiteau—made, when tried recently at Washington for that crime. He claimed that the desire to murder the noble President, whose death all good men mourned, was an inspiration "from God, direct and immediate," and, therefore, that he ought not to be considered a murderer. He was a true follower of Dr. Child's philosophy, and a striking illustration of how this "doctrine of devils" works in practice.

I repeat the charge, therefore, that Spiritualism directly promotes every crime, and most clearly murder, as being a

characteristic of its author, "who was a murderer from the beginning" of the history of our race.

Again, your quotation from page 166 is only a part of a sentence, which closes with these words—"They (meaning crime and punishment) are directly legitimate to that condition of life which produces them." And, on the same page, he declares "there is no distinction of merit and demerit to be instituted between the *good man* and the *bad man*"—thus completely nullifying your garbled quotation.

The quotation from page 196 is not from Dr. Child at all, but is from Lysander Spooner's letter to him; and any value which might be attached to it is at once destroyed, when he says, further on—"I think that God caused everything that we call good and evil."

Again, at page 197, the quotation—"The nearer we come to God, the purer grows the soul," is from a letter of Miss Lizzie Doten; and in it she also writes—"Evil is only evil by comparison. She adds this illustration—"The roots may be compared to evil, the trunk and top to good. The ramifications of each are similar; both are good, both are necessary." She also says:—"Evil is the friction of life; it is the conservative power that prevents men from flying off in a tangent to perfection; it is a necessity; it is the regulator of the soul's growth; it times the progress of the soul." She is an out-and-out supporter of this "child of the devil." That is my reply to your question—"What say you of this?" when making the quotation.

Again, the words you quote from page 207 are not those of Dr. Child, but an extract from an article, by L. C. Howe, in the *Golden Age*. He distinctly says he does not approve of Dr. Child's doctrine, and cannot "synonymize the words 'right' and 'wrong,' so as to see everything alike lovely and meritorious." So, whatever value may attach to your quotation—"If our inner life be pure and true," &c., it must not be credited to Dr. Child.

Now I have finished the examination of all your quotations, and what comes of all the nonsense you have written concerning them, and especially of your statement—"I venture to assert that they express the real aims of Dr. Child's book?"

Why, only this, that you ventured to sea in a leaky, rotten ship, which has gone down with all its cargo of lies.

And now I come to one of your last reckless charges against me—that of unfairly quoting Andrew Jackson Davis as endorsing Dr. Child's book.

Now, I quoted with the most perfect accuracy, the only sentence I gave from his hazy and cautious letter to Dr. Child; and, notwithstanding his misty, qualifying sentences, which you quote as my condemnation, I am prepared to re-affirm that he does

most fully endorse the whole aim of Dr. Child's book. I will prove that these qualifications are valueless, in the light of his own writings. This Andrew Jackson Davis' works are well known to me, and as he is one of the greatest exponents of the "doctrines of devils," called Spiritualistic Philosophy, I will devote a little attention to him before closing this reply.

I assert that A. J. Davis teaches the same doctrine as to the nature of Good and Evil, which is the root of the whole question. In his book entitled "The History and Philosophy of Evil," he asks the question, at page 72—"But what is this evil?" and answers it as follows:—"It is the temporal subversion or misdirection of the absolute and omnipresent good." That is his first stage. His next is at page 75, where he says:—"I hesitate not to affirm, once for all, that *Ignorance is a negative or passive fulcrum upon which the intellectual lever of spiritual progress acts with an almighty and universal sweep.*" His position, therefore, is, that Ignorance is the basis of progress—a doctrine which is most certainly true of Spiritualism, since its course is downward into utter chaos and darkness. On the same page, he tells us that "earthly evil, when not abused, is the dungeon-door we pass through, or perhaps the wild highway over which we travel, to reach the goal of the absolute Good."

Delightful doctrine—for devils! The broad road of evil is, therefore, with him, as with Dr. Child, the spiritualistic highway to heaven. But, lest there should be any doubt as to his real meaning, I quote some confirmatory passages from his chapter on "The Harmonial Cure of Evil"—an absurd title, from his point of view.

At page 109 he says:—"At length Evil has been thoroughly analysed, by the most competent and authoritative Chemists known in the shoreless universe—viz., the immutable principles of Father God and the fixed laws of Mother Nature; and, strange as it may seem, it (Evil) is found to contain neither 'a devil' nor any elements of positive 'enmity' to human growth and happiness." There can be no mistake now, surely, as to his meaning: Evil is not an enemy to man, and, therefore, it must be a friend. Indeed, we have only to go a little further to find it so defined; for, on the same page, he writes:—"Evil is *not* a principle, is *not* a devil, is *not* a fluid, is *not* a solid, is *not* a sentiment, or a thing to be blasphemed against and fought down like a wild beast; but *quite otherwise.* These authoritative teachers have demonstrated positively that *what men term 'evil'* is but the temporary subversion of individual rights, the incidental misdirection of local forces, and the inversion of private faculties, **INNATELY GOOD.**" Oh, this is a very ideal of philosophy for every fiend in hell and on earth. Evil is not to be "fought against"—for it is **INNATELY GOOD!** What a farce, then, it is to talk

about "the cure of evil"—it ought to be embraced and loved! But, since some people will insist upon a prescription for something they fancy to be "evil," this doctor, whose diploma is granted from perdition, gives this, at page 111—"The true cure of Evil is the true use of Evil." This is certainly a new application of the saying—"Set a thief to catch a thief;" it is setting Satan to cast out Satan—a very likely business.

The application of it in daily life would soon produce utter chaos, and make earth worse than hell itself. But, let me give yet further proof of how "peculiarly spiritualistic" this doctrine is, as expounded by this arch-deceiver, whose pestilential writings have been widely circulated in America and Europe.

In his book entitled "The Penetralia," at page 390, we are favoured with a report of a spiritualistic "Utilitarian Convention," which passed fourteen resolutions, the twelfth of which reads thus:—"Resolved—That 'evil,' so-called, is *not a transgression of any law*, either physical or moral," &c. Can it be necessary to go further in quotation? Here is the very key-note of Dr. Child's "Whatever is, is Right," since "evil" is held to be a transgression of no law, either physical or moral. Hence, everything we have been accustomed to consider physically or morally wrong, is "authoritatively" declared to be lawful and right. Dr. Child only goes a little further, and writes yet more plainly. He declares, as I pointed out in my previous letter, that "Evil does not exist" (at page 67); and "That which seems to be evil, is not evil intrinsically; it is only the natural operation of things for the production of good." He also says (at page 129):—"THERE ARE NO EVIL SPIRITS. Broadly and unreservedly I do declare that I know nothing of the existence of evil spirits anywhere in God's creation. ALL SPIRITS ARE GOOD, because immortal."

This is just the doctrine which devils would like to see triumph; and it is the root-doctrine of Spiritualism beyond all question.

I leave this portion of my examination of your letter, feeling sure that, to candid minds, I have demonstrated the substantial unity between Dr. Child and Mr. A. J. Davis; and I have already shown, beyond your power even to challenge the assertion, that these writers authoritatively represent Spiritualism as a whole.

But I must add to this demonstration a few illustrations from the works of A. J. Davis, to show the *practical immorality* of Spiritualism.

A. J. Davis has distinguished himself by his "specially spiritualistic" attacks upon the sacred institution of marriage, which lies at the foundation of all national virtue, happiness, and progress.

In his "Genesis and Ethics of Conjugal Love," at page 46, he says:—"The true plan of correcting the evils in social life is,

first, to *provide by law for the legitimacy of all children*, and for their support and education from public or private funds; second, to *restrict marriage and parentage*, as far as possible, to competent persons; and third, to let those who make mistakes, in spite of caution and the law, *get out as easily and voluntarily* as they got into the trouble." Here, then, is distinctly taught a diabolical doctrine, which would destroy the foundations of all morality. If divorce is to be thus easy, the land will be full of vice, family life will be impossible, parental and political obligations will be set at naught, and the utmost confusion and danger must follow. The evil results would defy description and exaggeration.

In proof of the real nature of this attack, I now refer to another work of A. J. Davis, entitled "*The Great Harmonia*"—Vol. IV.: "*The Reformer*"—where, from pages 397 to 425, he is pleased to treat of what he calls "*The Rights and Wrongs of Divorce.*"

A more grossly wicked and immoral chapter was never penned.

He begins with an attack upon the Lord Jesus, and a laudation of the Pharisees; and he declares that "*the history of divorce is coeval with the history of marriage;*" and suggests that "*the first idea of divorce occurred in Paradise.*" He quotes with approval from many enemies of marriage. For instance, at page 409, he says:—"In regard to marriage and divorce, he (Mr. Andrews) speaks out like a lover of truth—not intuitionally, but intellectually. He *opposes the perpetual or exclusive marriage.* He *objects to civil marriages*, because they make personal property of woman, restricting her self-sovereignty, and ultimating in compound selfishness and imperfect offspring. He says:—"*The man and woman who do love, can live together in purity without any mummerly at all.*" Now, what this means is clear enough—namely, the abolition of marriage in any form, and all the consequent horrors of such a state. On page 410, he quotes approvingly from another, who writes:—"A love may be genuine and true for the time, and not for all time. *The woman who filled my ideal twenty years ago, may have no attraction for me now.* There is no evident reason why *the law of variety*, which extends to the studies, pursuits, pleasures, tastes, and passions, should fail when it comes to the question of *variety in love.*" What does this "peculiarly spiritualistic" teaching mean, if it does not mean approval of general immorality, base desertion of wives—especially when advanced in years—polygamy, or worse? Again, he quotes, at page 413, approvingly from Dr. Nichols, who says:—"If by marriage is meant an indissoluble monogamy (or union with one), a legal exclusive bond of a civilized institution, I deny that it *ever is, or ever can be, right.* I assert that *the promise of a man to love any woman as long as he lives is WRONG.* I denounce, therefore, *the civilized marriage* as a violation of the laws of Nature, and the commands of God." Where the "seducing

spirits" are now leading men, in "forbidding to marry," as God's word prophesied they would (1 Timothy, iv. 1-3), is now, I hope, become clear; and, if more proof is needed that it is to an ABYSS OF UNBRIDLED LUST AND SOCIAL CHAOS, I can find it in abundance in the writings and practices of many leading spiritualists. Such proof may be found at pages 418, 422, and 433 of the volume from which I have just quoted, and at pages 65, 66, 100, and 101 of A. J. Davis's book on "Conjugal Love," and in many other "spiritualistic" works.

But one of the crowning proofs is to be found in the history and person of Andrew Jackson Davis himself, as recorded in the "Magic Staff; or, Autobiography of A. J. Davis." He gives, without shame, the story of his two marriages, which shows that he induced both women to get divorces from their husbands in order to marry him; and that, both in law and in fact, he was living in a state of adultery in 1876, when the edition of the book in my possession was published. The proof of this may be seen at page 550, where a decree of the Supreme Court, Erie County, New York, is quoted. That decree grants a divorce to Mr. S. G. Love, on the ground "that the defendant (his wife) is now, and has been for some time *living in open adultery with the said A. J. Davis*, and that the said defendant, Mary F. Love, now calls herself Mary F. Davis; and it shall be lawful for the said plaintiff to marry again, as if the defendant was actually dead; but it shall not be lawful for the said defendant, *Mary F. Love, to marry again until the said plaintiff is actually dead.*" This decree was obtained in 1856. Hence, in 1876, *A. J. Davis had been living, from 1855, in a state of adultery for more than twenty years*: for Mr. S. G. Love was then living, and may be still. In 1854, Mary F. Love had, upon her own application got, in a scandalous way, after an understanding with Davis, a divorce in the State of Indiana; but it was of no avail, either to herself, or Mr. S. G. Love, who, about two years after, sued for, and obtained the Supreme Court decree I have quoted. The whole story, even upon A. J. Davis's own version of it, is a scandalously bad and immoral transaction, and the story of his first marriage is not a whit better or cleaner—in some respects it is worse.

I give these facts as "specially spiritualistic" illustrations of the effects, upon leading spiritualists, of the immoral doctrines of Spiritualism; and I have been most careful to assert nothing except that which spiritualistic works, of easy reference in this city, can verify. If I were to state facts within my personal knowledge, I could add most heartrending illustrations of the misery and ruin which these horrible and detestable doctrines have wrought, in breaking up once happy homes, and destroying the precious lives of many persons, after ruining them body and soul.

But I forbear. To those who are wise, I have said enough to show the Dead Sea of Vice and Crime towards which the polluted streams of Spiritualism are rapidly flowing.

And now, I leave candid readers of these letters to judge between us as to your final charge against me of "twisting and turning" the language of authors from whom I quote, and, also, as to whom "the restraint of a moral *clotûre*" should be applied.

I have, and you know it, quoted fairly throughout, and have reasoned upon well-established facts, which it is impossible for you to escape from; and the irresistible logic of truth and fact crushes your wretched system into the dust, so far as its moral and progressive pretensions are concerned.

And, at last, I close this most unsavoury task, not without a sense of relief, but with a still greater sense of gratitude to God for His goodness in enabling me to perform it. May it promote His glory, and your good; and, especially, be blessed to many who have been seduced to sail with you in the Pirate Ship of Demons, called Spiritualism, which is bound for the port of Hell, from whence it sailed.

You scoff at the warnings in my last; but that will not deter me from adding one more, to the many which these letters contain; and I pray you to heed it, ere the "Woe," in all its divine force, comes down upon your soul.

"Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" (Isaiah v. 20).—I am, faithfully yours,

JOHN ALEX. DOWIE.

Mr. Thomas Walker.